A

TEXT-BOOK

OF THE

HISTORY OF DOCTRINES.

BY

DR. K. R. HAGENBACH,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BASLE.

THE EDINBURGH TRANSLATION OF C. W. BUCH, REVISED WITH LARGE ADDITIONS FROM THE FOURTH GERMAN EDITION, AND OTHER SOURCES.

BY HENRY B. SMITH, D.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

VOLUME II.

NEW YORK:

SHELDON & CO., No. 677 BROADWAY

AND Nos. 214 & 216 MERCER STREET,

UNDER GRAND CENTRAL HOTEL.

1872.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1862, by
SHELDON & COMPANY,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

PREFATORY NOTE.

In preparing this revision of the second volume of Hagenbach's History of Doctrines, the same plan has been pursued as in the first volume. The translation has been corrected throughout. All the additional matter of the fourth German edition, which was very considerable in the later periods, has been translated. The references to English and American literature are made as full as the limits of the text-book allow. In addition to this, new sections have been added, on portions of the History of Doctrines not fully handled, or wholly neglected in the original, viz. The German Reformed Theology, pp. 175–177; The French School of Saumur, and Theology in England and Scotland, pp. 180–194; The English Deism, pp. 223–229; and five sections, pp. 416–451, on the History of Theology and Philosophy in England, Scotland, and our own country.—The literature of English and American theology is given with disproportionate fulness, in the hope that this may be a convenience to ministers and students, as it is not elsewhere collected in a compendious form.

H. B. S.

CONTENTS

THIRD PERIOD.

THE AGE OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

(CONTINUED.)

THIRD DIVISION.

ANTHROPOLOGY.

PAGE

§ 173. General Definitions 13
174. The Immortality of the Soul 16
175. Man in his State of Innocence prior to the Fall 17
176. The Fall of Man, and Sin in General 22
177. Consequences of the First Sin. Original Sin. Freedom of the Will 25
178. Exception to the Universal Corruption of Mankind. The Immaculate Conception of the Virgin 29

FOURTH DIVISION.

CHRISTOLOGY AND SOTERIOLOGY.

§ 179. The Greek Church on Christology. The Adoption Controversy in the West. Nihilianism 35
180 Redemption and Atonement 41
181 Further Development of the Doctrine of Redemption and Atonement 46
182 The Connection between Soteriology and Christology 51

FIFTH DIVISION.

THE ORDO SALUTIS.

§ 183. Predestination. The Controversy of Gottschalk 56
184. Further Development of the Doctrine of Predestination 60
185. Appropriation of Divine Grace 63
186. Faith and Good Works. The Meritoriousness of the latter 67

SIXTH DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS.

PAGE

§ 187 The Church ... 71
188. The Worship of Saints ... 74
189. The Sacraments ... 76
190. The same Subject continued ... 80
191. Baptism ... 84
192. Confirmation ... 87
193. The Lord's Suppper ... 89
1. *The Controversy respecting the Eucharist previous to the Rise of Scholasticism.—Paschasius Radbert and Ratramn.—Berengar* ... 89
194. 2. *The Scholastic Development of the Doctrine. Transubstantiation. The Sacrifice of the Mass* ... 95
195. The Withholding of the Cup from the Laity. Concomitance ... 102
196. Dissenting Opinions ... 104
197. The Greek Church ... 107
198. The Sacrament of Penance ... 109
199. The Sacrament of Extreme Unction ... 112
200. The Sacrament of Orders ... 114
201. The Sacrament of Matrimony ... 116

SEVENTH DIVISION.

ESCHATOLOGY.

§ 202. Millennarianism. The approaching End of the World. Antichrist ... 119
203. The Influence of the Mediæval Tendencies and of Christian Art, upon Eschatology ... 121
204. The Resurrection of the Body ... 122
205. The General Judgment ... 124
206. Purgatory ... 128
207. The Sleep of the Soul ... 129
208. The Localities of the Future World. (Heaven, Hell, and Intermediate State.) 130
209. The State of the Blessed and the Damned ... 132
210. Eternity of the Punishment of Hell. Restitution of all Things ... 138

FOURTH PERIOD.

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE RISE OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF LEIBNITZ AND WOLF IN GERMANY; FROM THE YEAR 1517 TO ABOUT 1720.

THE AGE OF POLEMICO-ECCLESIASTICAL SYMBOLISM; THE CONFLICT OF CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.

A. GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FOURTH PERIOD.

§ 211. Introduction ... 139
212. The Principles of Protestantism ... 140
213. Relation of the History of Doctrines in the present Period to that of former Periods (Symbolism) ... 142

1. *The Lutheran Church.*

PAGE

§ 214. Luther and Melancthon 143
215. The Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church 146
216. The Systematic Theology of the Lutheran Church 150
217. Lutheran Mysticism, Theosophy and Asceticism 154
218. Reforming Tendencies. John Valentin Andreä, Calixt, Spener, Thomasius. 157

2. *The Reformed Church.*

§ 219. Zwingle and Calvin 159
220. The Symbolical Books of the Reformed Church 162
221. *a.* Symbolical Writings prior to the Time of Calvin 163
222. *b.* Symbolical Writings under the Influence of Calvin 164
223. The Systematic Theology of the Reformed Church 170
223, *a.* [The German Reformed Theology.] 175
224. Mysticism in the Reformed Church 177
225. Influence of the Cartesian Philosophy. More Liberal Tendencies 178
225, *a.* [The French School of Saumur.] 180
225, *b.* [Theology in England and Scotland.] 182

3. *The Roman Catholic Church.*

§ 226. The Council of Trent, and the Catechismus Romanus 195
227. The Theologians of the Roman Catholic Church 197
228. Jansenism 201
229. The Mysticism of the Roman Catholic Church 203
230. Liberal Tendencies in Criticism and Systematic Theology. Transition to the following Period 206

4. *The Greek Church.*

§ 231. The Greek Church 206

5. *Minor Religious Parties (Sects).*

§ 232. Minor Religious Parties (Sects) 208
233. *a.* Anabaptists (Mennonites) 208
234. *b.* Unitarians (Socinians) 210
235. *c.* Arminians (Remonstrants) 214
236. *d.* Quakers 216
237. Attempts at Union (Syncretism) 218
238. Influence of Philosophy. Deism. Apologetics 220
238, *a.* [The English Deism.] 223
239. Division of the Material 228

B. THE SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FOURTH PERIOD.

FIRST CLASS.

THE CHARACTERISTIC DOCTRINES OF ROMANISM AND PROTESTANTISM.

(INCLUDING THE OPPOSITION BETWEEN LUTHERANS AND CALVINISTS, AND THE OPINIONS OF THE MINOR RELIGIOUS PARTIES AND SECTS.)

FIRST DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINES CONCERNING THE SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE.

(FORMAL PRINCIPLE.)

PAGE

§ 240. Romanism and Protestantism 230
Divergent Views of various Sects 236
241. *a.* The Mystical Principle 236
242, *b.* The Rationalistic Principle (Socinians) 239
243. The further Development of the Doctrine concerning the Holy Scriptures, Inspiration, and Interpretation 240
244. Relation of Scripture to Tradition 248

SECOND DIVISION.

ANTHROPOLOGY, JUSTIFICATION, AND THE ECONOMY OF REDEMPTION

a. ANTHROPOLOGY.

§ 245. Man Prior to the Fall 251
246. The Fall and its Consequences (Original Sin) 255
247. Antagonisms within the Confessions themselves 261
248. Further Development of the Doctrine concerning Man, in Theory as well as in Practice 263

b. THE DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION.

§ 249. Freedom and Grace. Predestination 268
250. Controversies respecting Predestination within the Denominations themselves. 277
251. Justification and Sanctification. Faith and Works 281
252. Fluctuations within the Denominations 286
253. The Economy of Redemption 288

THIRD DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINES CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND ITS MEANS OF GRACE, CONCERNING SAINTS, IMAGES, THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, AND PURGATORY.

(THE PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES.)

PAGE

§ 254. Introduction 289
255. The Church and Ecclesiastical Power 290
256. Further Development of the Doctrine concerning the Church 299
257. Adoration of Saints and Images 301
258. The Sacraments 303
259. The Sacrifice of the Mass. The Lord's Supper 308
260. Internal Fluctuations and further Doctrinal Development 323
261. The Doctrine concerning Purgatory 326

SECOND CLASS.

DOCTRINES IN WHICH PROTESTANTS AND ROMAN CATHOLICS MORE OR LESS AGREED (IN OPPOSITION TO THE MINOR SECTS).

FIRST DIVISION.

THEOLOGY PROPER.

§ 262. Trinitarians and Antitrinitarians 328
263. The Systematic Development of the Doctrine concerning God, together with its Mystical and Speculative Aspects 333
264. Creation and Preservation of the World. Providence and Government of the World 337
265. Angels and Demons (Devil) 341

SECOND DIVISION.

CHRISTOLOGY AND SOTERIOLOGY (INCLUDING THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING BAPTISM AND ESCHATOLOGY).

§ 266. The Person of Christ 344
267. Further Doctrinal Development and Internal Controversies 351
268. The Doctrine of Atonement 354
269. Differences of Opinion within the Lutheran and Reformed Churches 362
270. Baptism 364
271. Eschatology 370

FIFTH PERIOD.

FROM THE YEAR 1720 TO THE PRESENT DAY.

THE AGE OF CRITICISM, OR SPECULATION, AND OF THE ANTAGONISM BETWEEN FAITH AND KNOWLEDGE, PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIANITY, REASON AND REVELATION; AND ATTEMPTS TO RECONCILE THESE ANTAGONISMS.

A. GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FIFTH PERIOD.

PAGE

§ 272. Introduction ... 373
273. Influence of Philosophy upon Theology ... 375
274. The Philosophy of Wolf ... 376
275. Influence of Deism and Naturalism. Rationalism ... 378
276. Works of Apologetical Writers. Changes in the Mode of Treating Theology. Modern Compendiums of Systematic Theology ... 382
277. Reaction. Edict of Religion. Orthodox Pietism ... 388
278. Zinzendorf and the United Brethren. Wesley and the Methodists. Swedenborg ... 390
279. The Philosophy of Kant. Rationalism and Supernaturalism ... 394
280. Modern Speculative Philosophy. Fichte. Schelling ... 398
281. Herder and Jacobi. De Wette and Schleiermacher ... 401
282. Attempts at Restoration. Practical Piety and Modern Theology ... 404
283. The Philosophy of Hegel and the Young Hegelians ... 407
284. Latest Rationalistic Reaction ... 410
285. The Protestant Church and Doctrine out of Germany ... 412
285, *a*. [Theology in England in the Eighteenth Century.] ... 416
285, *b*. [English Theology and Philosophy in the Present Century.] ... 423
285, *c*. [Theology and Philosophy in Scotland.] ... 430
285, *d*. [Theology in the United States of America. New England. Edwards and his School.] ... 435
285, *e*. [Theology and Philosophy in the United States.—Continued.] ... 442
286. Conflicts of the Confessions ... 452
287. The Roman Catholic Church. German Catholicism ... 454
288. The Russian-Greek Church ... 459

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FIFTH PERIOD.

FIRST DIVISION.

PROLEGOMENA. RELIGION. REVELATION. BIBLE AND TRADITION.

(MIRACLE AND PROPHECY.)

§ 289. Religion ... 461
290. Truth and Divine Origin of Christianity. Perfectibility. Reason and Revelation ... 463
291. The Word of God. Scripture and Tradition. Scripture and Spirit ... 465
292. Inspiration and Interpretation of Scripture. Miracles and Prophecy ... 467

SECOND DIVISION.

THEOLOGY PROPER. CREATION AND PROVIDENCE. THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING ANGELS AND DEVILS.

PAGE
§ 293. Deism. Theism. Pantheism 474
294. The Existence and Attributes of God 476
295. The Doctrine of the Trinity 478
296. Creation and Preservation of the World. Providence, Theodicy 481
297. The Doctrine Concerning Angels and Demons 482

THIRD DIVISION.

ANTHROPOLOGY. CHRISTOLOGY. SOTERIOLOGY AND THE ECONOMY OF REDEMPTION.

§ 298. The Doctrines concerning Man, Sin, and Liberty 485
299. Christology 489
300. The Doctrine of Atonement 496
301. The Economy of Redemption. Justification and Sanctification (Faith and Good Works). Grace and Liberty. Predestination 503

FOURTH DIVISION.

THE CHURCH. SACRAMENTS. ESCHATOLOGY.

§ 302. The Doctrine concerning the Church 511
303. The Means of Grace. The Sacraments 513
304. Eschatology 517
INDEX 523

THIRD PERIOD.

THE AGE OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

(CONTINUED).

THIRD DIVISION.

ANTHROPOLOGY.

§ 173.

GENERAL DEFINITIONS.

The Greek church adhered to the opinions of the earlier fathers, which were collected and more fully developed by *John Damascenus*.[1] He, as well as most of the Western theologians, adopted the current twofold division into body and soul. While *John Scotus Erigena* regarded the bodily constitution of man, and even his condition as a creature, as a result of sin,[2] *John of Damascus* and the disciples of the school of St. Victor, recognized in the union of the soul with the body a higher purpose of God, and a moral lesson for man.[3] The theory designated as Creatianism, which had contested the victory with Traducianism during the preceding period, was now more precisely defined.[4] The psychological views of the mystics stood in a close relation with their entire system, founded upon subjective experience; and at all events, it had a greater tendency to lead into the depths of religious contemplation, than the subtleties of the scholastics, which had rather to do with what is external.[5]

[1] On the one hand, cosmology was introduced into the doctrine of creation; on the other, both psychology and physiology were introduced into anthropology. With respect to the last two, theologians founded their notions especially upon the physics of Aristotle. Thus *John Damascenus*, De Fide Orthod. ii. 12–28, treated of the four temperaments (humoribus, χυμοῖς) of man, as corresponding to the four elements of the world; of the various faculties of the soul, etc. He everywhere retained the principal definitions

of earlier theologians concerning human *liberty*, etc. (Compare especially c. 25–28.)

[2] De Divis. Naturæ, iv. 10: Non enim homo, si non peccaret, inter partes mundi administraretur, sed universitatem omnino sibi subditam administraret, nec corporeis his sensibus mortalis corporis ad illum regendum uteretur, verum sine ullo sensibili motu vel locali vel temporali, sola rationabili contuiter naturalium et interiorum ejus causarum facillimo rectæ voluntatis usu secundum leges divinas æternaliter ac sine errore gubernaret. [For a full exposition of the views of Erigena on body and soul, see Christlieb's work, Leben u. Lehre der Joh. Scot. Erigena, 1860, p. 248, *sq.* He rests on the Aristotelian view, that formless matter is incorporeal, and can only be known by reason. The body in relation to man is an accident. Omnis *οὐσία* incorruptibilis est. Omne incorruptibile corpus materiale non est. Omnis igitur *οὐσία* corpus materiale non est (De Div. Nat. i. 49). The body, he says, is made up of points, lines, surfaces, and solidity, all of which are incorporeal, etc.]

[3] *John Damascenus*, l. c. c. 12. According to *Hugo of St. Victor*, (quoted by *Liebner*, p. 395), the union of the soul with the body is a type of the mystical union of God with man. *Richard of St. Victor* adopted the same opinion (see *Engelhardt*, p. 181), which was also held by *Peter Lombard* (Sent. Lib. i. Dist. 3. 9., and Lib. ii. Dist. 17). *Thomas Aquinas* gave a more fully developed system of psychology. (Summa P. i. 9. 75–90. Cramer vii. p. 473.) [Comp. *Plassmann*, Psychologie d. Schule des Aquin., 1860.

[4] *Anselm* defended creatianism *negatively*, by opposing traducianism, De Conceptu Virginali, c. 7: Quod autem mox ab ipsa conceptione rationalem animam habeat (homo), nullus humanus suscipit sensus. *Hugo St. Victor* pronounced positively in favor of creatianism; de Sacram. Lib. i. P. vii. c. 30: fides catholica magis credendum elegit animas quotidie corporibus vivificandis sociandas de nihilo fieri, quam secundum corporis naturam et carnis humanæ proprietatem de traduce propagari. Comp. *Liebner*, p. 416. [Also in De Anima, ascribed to Hugo (see Note 5): Dicimus autem rationales animas pro essentia fieri quotidie de nihilo novas, sed pro consimili natura ex institutione divina non utique novas. Quales enim in exordio Deus die sexto masculo et feminæ dedit, tales quotidie inspirat singulis, nova de nihilo creatione, non nova institutione.] *Robert Pulleyn* brought forward some very singular and abstruse arguments against traducianism, see *Cramer*, vi. p. 474. *Peter Lombard* also espoused creatianism in decided terms, Sent. Lib. ii. Dist. 17. C.: De aliis (*i. e.*, the souls posterior to Adam and Eve), certissime sentiendum est, quod in corpore creentur. Creando enim infundit eas Deus, et infundendo creat.—*Thomas Aquinas*, Summa P. i. Qu. 118, Art. 1, made a distinction between the anima sensitiva and anima intellectiva (which was similar to the distinction formerly made between *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*, or *νοῦς*.) The former is propagated in a physical manner, inasmuch as it is allied to the physical; the latter is created by God. [Comp. Aquinas, Contra Gentes, ii. 89: Anima igitur vegetabilis, quæ primo inest, cum embryo vivit vita plantæ, corrumpitur, et succedit anima perfectior, quæ est nutritiva et sensitiva simul; et tunc embryo vivit vita animalis; hac autem

corrupta, succedit anima rationalis *ab extrinseco* immissa, licet præcedentes fuerint virtute seminis. Aquinas's chief argument (in Summa Theol. Pt. I. qu. 118, Art. 2, is, that an immaterial substance could only be produced by creation.] More precise definitions were given by *Odo of Cambray* (A. D 1113), De Peccato Originali, Lib. ii. (in Maxima Biblioth. PP. Ludg. T. xxi. p. 230–34). Comp. *Schröckh*, xxviii. p. 436. He designated creatianism as the *orthodox* opinion.—*Friar Berthold* illustrated this theory in a popular way in his sermons, quoted by *Kling*, p. 209 (*Grimm*, p. 206): "As life is given to the child in his mother's womb, so the angel pours the soul into him, and God Almighty pours the soul with the angel into him." The pre-existence of the soul still had a defender in *Fredegis of Tours*, in the ninth century; see *Ritter*, Gesch. d. Phil. vii. 190, *sq.*

[5] Concerning the mystical psychological views of the disciples of the school of St. Victor, see *Liebner*, p. 334, ss. The three fundamental powers by which the soul knows, are imaginatio, ratio (rather understanding than reason), and intelligentia. Cogitatio corresponds to the first, meditatio to the second, and contemplatio to the third. [*Hugo* in his Comm. in Joelem (Schöpff's Aurora, iv. 38): Tria quoque sunt genera visionum; prima est materialis, secunda spiritualis, tertia intellectualis. Prima concipit elementata, secunda imaginata, tertia ab omni circumscriptione est aliena, utcunque Deum concipiens, virtutes quoque et vitia.] The treatise De Anima, Lib. iv., reprinted in Opp. Hugonis Ed. Rothomag. T. ii. p. 132, ss., which was used as a compendium by the earlier scholastics no less than by the mystics, is sometimes attributed to Hugo of St. Victor, but has probably *Alcherus*, abbot of Stella (A. D. 1147), for its author. See *Liebner*, p. 493, ss., and *Engelhardt*, Dogmengeschichte ii. p. 119.—*Bonaventura* and *Gerson* adopted the same psychological notions. According to the former, *spiritual vision* is the principal idea. We see all things in God through the medium of a supernatural light (comp. above, vol. 1, § 161.) *He*, too, distinguished between sensation, imagination, reason (understanding), intellectus, the highest faculty of the mind, and the *synteresis*, or conscience.—*Gerson* De Theol. Myst. consid. x.–xxv.) divided the essence of the soul into two fundamental powers (vis cognitiva et vis affectiva.) Starting from its higher functions, he then divided the former as follows: intelligentia simplex (the pure faculty of intellectual vision), ratio (understanding), and sensualitas (the faculty of perception by the senses.) They are related to each other, as contemplatio, meditatio, and cogitatio. The highest degree of the vis affectiva is the *Synteresis*,* the next is the appetitus rationalis, and the lowest is the appetitus animalis; see *Haudeshagen*, p. 37, ss., *Ch. Schmidt*, p. 76, ss. [*Schwab's* John Gerson, 1859.]

* Synteresis est vis animæ appetitiva, suscipiens immediate a Deo naturalem quandam inclinationem ad bonum, per quam trahitur insequi motionem boni ex apprehensione simplicis intelligentiæ præsentati, quoted by *Liebner*, p. 340. Comp. *Bonavent.* Compend. II. 51.

§ 174.

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

The assertion of some of the earlier Greek theologians, that the ψυχή, as such, is not immortal, but obtains immortality only from its connection with the πνεῦμα, was repeated in the Greek church by *Nicolas of Methone*.[1] In the West, the schoolmen generally taught the immortality of the soul as a *theological truth;* but the chief leaders of the scholastic sects, *Thomas Aquinas* and *Duns Scotus*, were at issue on the question, whether reason furnishes satisfactory proofs of that doctrine.[2] *Raimund of Sabunde* rested belief in God, as well as belief in immortality, upon the idea of freedom, and the necessity of moral sanctions.[3] But the advocates of Platonism, in particular, towards the close of the present period, were at much pains to prove the immortality of the soul, in opposition to the Aristotelians.[4] At last, the Council of the Lateran, held A. D. 1513, under Pope Leo X., pronounced the natural immortality of the soul to be an article of faith, and discarded the distinction between theological and philosophical truths as untenable.[5]

[1] *John Damascenus* taught (De Fide Orthod. ii. 12, p. 179), that the soul is ἀθάνατος. *Nicolas* of Methone, on the contrary, expressed himself as follows (Refut. p. 207 and 208, quoted by Ullmann, p. 89, 90): "It is not every soul that neither perishes nor dies, but only the rational, truly spiritual and divine soul, which is made perfect through virtue, by participating in the grace of God. For the souls of irrational beings, and still more, of plants, may perish with the things which they inhabit, because they can not be separated from bodies which are made up of parts, and may be dissolved into their elements." Compare with this passage what he said, Refut. p. 120: "If any created being is eternal, it is not so *by* and *for* itself, nor *through* itself, but by the goodness of God; for all that is made and created has a beginning, and retains its existence only through the goodness of the Creator."

[2] The scholastics, by closely adhering to *Aristotle*, were naturally led to the inquiry, in what sense their master himself had taught the immortality of the soul, in the definition he gave of its essence, viz., that it is ἐντελέχεια ἡ πρώτη σώματος φυσικοῦ ὀργανικοῦ (De Anim. ii. 1); comp. Münscher, edit. by Von Cölln ii. p. 90. But Christianity set forth the immortality of the soul in so convincing a manner, that it became necessary, either to return to the old distinction made between natural immortality, and that immortality which is communicated by grace, which was, however, possible only in connection with the threefold division (viz., body, soul and spirit), or to admit a collision between theological and philosophical truths. The distinction which *Thomas Aquinas* drew between anima sensitiva and anima intellectiva (§ 173, note 3), enabled him to ascribe immortality to the latter

alone. Comp. Summa P. 1. Qu. 76, Art. 6., where he in fact contented himself with saying: Animam humanam, quam dicimus *intellectivum principium*, esse incorruptibilem. But he also held that the *intellectus* alone is above space and time (hic et nunc), while the *sensus* moves in these categories and is restricted in its knowledge to the images (ideas, phantasms) borrowed from this sphere (intelligere cum phantasmate). As Anselm of Canterbury had inferred the existence of God himself from the idea of God, so Thomas Aquinas proved the immortality of the soul, in a similar manner, by an *ontological* argument: Intellectus apprehendit esse absolute et secundum omne tempus. Unde omne habens intellectum naturaliter desiderat esse semper. Naturale autem desiderium non potest esse inane. Omnis igitur intellectualis substantia est incorruptibilis. Com. *Engelhardt*, Dogmengeschichte ii. p. 123.—On the other hand, Scotus, whose views were more nearly allied to those of the nominalists, maintained: Non posse demonstrari, quod anima sit immortalis (Comm. in M. Sentent. L. II. Dist. 17. Qu. 1. Comp. Lib. iv. Dist. 43. Qu. 2). *Bonaventura*, on the contrary, asserted, De Nat. D. ii. 55: Animam esse immortalem, auctoritate ostenditur et ratione. Concerning the further attempts of *Moneta of Cremona* (who lived between the years 1220 and 1250), *William of Auvergne* (bishop of Paris from 1228 to 1249), and *Raimund Martini* (in his Pugio Fidei adv. Maur. P. i. c. 4), to prove the immortality of the soul, comp. Münscher, edit. by Von Cölln, p. 91, 92.

[3] Theol. Naturalis Tit. 92: Quoniam ex operibus hominis, in quantum homo est, nascitur meritum vel culpa, quibus debetur punitio vel præmium, et cum homo, quamdiu vivat, acquirit meritum vel culpam, et de illis non recipit retributiones nec punitiones dum vivit, et ordo universi non patitur, quod aliquid quantumcunque modicum remaneat irremuneratum neque impunitum: ideo necesse est, quod remaneat liberum arbitrium, quo fiat radix meritorum et culparum, ut recipiat debitum et rectam retributionem sive punitionem: quod fieri non posset, nisi remaneret liberum arbitrium. Unde cum culpa vel meritum remanet post mortem, necesse est etiam quod maneat liberum arbitrium, in quo est culpa vel meritum, et cui debetur punitio sive retributio, et in quo est capacitas præmii vel punitionis.

[4] Marsilius Ficinus, De Immortalitate Animæ Libri xviii. (Opp. Par. 641. fol.) an extract from which is given by *Buhle* (Geschichte der neuern Philosophie, vol. ii. p. 171–341.) "*This work*," says *Gieseler*, Dogmengesch. 498, "*is the one among all that are extant, containing the greatest variety of proofs of the spirituality and immortality of the soul.*"

[5] Acta Concil. Reg. T. xxxiv. (Par. 1644. fol.) p. 333, quoted by Münscher, ed. by Von Cölln, p. 92, 93.

§ 175.

MAN IN HIS STATE OF INNOCENCE PRIOR TO THE FALL.

It was one of the characteristic features of scholasticism, to waste the greatest amount of acuteness upon those parts of doctrinal

theology, which do not belong to the province either of psychological experience, or of history, properly so called, and concerning which the Sacred Scriptures give us rather intimations than distinct information. Among such subjects were the doctrine of the angels, and that of the state of the first man in paradise. Though both scholastics and mystics frequently applied allegorical interpretation to the biblical narrative of the primeval state,[1] the former used it in such a manner, as to represent the first man with historical accuracy, and to describe him as he came forth from the hands of his Maker.[2] In the opinion of some theologians, the justitia originalis was added to the pura naturalia, as a donum superadditum; while others, *e. g.* Thomas Aquinas, distinguished between the purely human, and the divine which is added, only in the abstract, but made them coincide in the concrete. According to the latter notion, man was created in the full possession of the divine righteousness, and not deprived of it till *after* the fall.[3] Most theologians still made a distinction between the *image* of God, and *resemblance* to God,[4] and adventured many conjectures respecting the former, as well as man's state of innocence in general.[5]— The definitions concerning the liberty of man were beset with the greatest difficulties. The fall of man would not have been possible, without the liberty of choice. But, according to Augustine, something more was required to constitute perfect righteousness, than the liberty of choice alluded to, inasmuch as man continued in the possession of it after his fall—viz. as a liberty to do evil. But if our first parents, on account of their having true freedom, were above the temptations to sin, how could they be seduced and fall? Anselm here avails himself of the distinction between *will* in general, and a *confirmed* or steadfast will (velle et pervelle).[6] According to *Hugo of St. Victor*, the liberty in question consisted indeed in the possibility of sinning or not sinning, but the disposition to good was stronger than the propensity to evil. Others adopted similar views.[7]

[1] *John Damascenus* (De Fide Orthodoxa ii. c. 10. p. 175.) connected the allegorical interpretation with the historical. As man himself is composed of body and soul, so his first dwelling-place was αἰσθητός as well as νοητός. According to him, sensual delight in the garden, and spiritual communion with God, are correlative ideas.—*Peter Lombard* theoretically adopted the literal interpretation of the Mosaic narrative, Sent. ii. Dist. 17. E., though he also considered it a type of the church; but many of his practical expositions were allegorical; *e. g.* Dist. 24. H., quoted by Münscher, ed. by Von Cölln, p. 94. According to him, the serpent represents that sensuality which still suggests sinful thoughts to man; the woman is the inferior part of reason, which is first seduced, and afterwards leads man (the higher reason) into temptation. *Thomas Aquinas* also taught, P. i. Qu. 102. Art. 1.:

Ea enim, quæ de Paradiso in Scriptura dicuntur, per modum narrationis historicæ proponuntur (in accordance with his hermeneutical principle, see vol. 1. § 164, note 4). On the other hand, *Scotus Erigena* boldly raised doubts as to the literal interpretation of the narrative (De Divis. Natura iv. 15, p. 196.), and regarded it as an ideal description of the happiness which would have been the lot of mankind, if our first parents had resisted temptation: Fuisse Adam temporaliter in Paradiso, priusquam de costa ejus mulier fabricaretur, dicat quis potest.....Nec unquam steterat, nam si saltem vel parvo spatio stetisset, necessario ad aliquam perfectionem perveniret..... p. 197: Non enim credibile est, eundem hominem et in contemplatione æternæ pacis stetisse et suadente femina, serpentis veneno corrupta, corruisse. See Baur, Versöhnungslehre, p. 127; Lehre d. Dreieinigkeit, ii. 306, and the remarkable interpretation of Luke, x. 30, there cited. [Non ait; homo quidam erat in Jerusalem et incidit in latrones. Nam si in Jerusalem, hoc est in paradiso, humana natura permaneret, profecto in latrones, diabolum scilicet sateliitesque ejus, non incurreret. Prius ergo descendebat de paradiso, suæ voluntatis irrationabili motu impulsus, et in Jericho præcipitabatur, hoc est, in defectum instabilitatemque rerum temporalium. De Divis. Naturæ, iv. 15.]

[2] This led to a multitude of absurd questions concerning the nature and durability of their bodies, *e. g.* why the man had been created before the woman? and why the latter had been made out of the rib of the former? whether, and in what manner, the propagation of the race would have taken place, if our first parents had continued in their state of innocence? whether their children would have inherited their original righteousness? whether more males or more females would have been born? "*What dreams! How could men so sedate and grave as monks were, or ought to have been, waste so much time upon the examination, discussion, and defence of such questions? In the Summa of Alexander Hales, this subject fills five pages in folio.*" Cramer, vii. p. 493.

[3] The former opinion was adopted by *Scotus Erigena*, Sent. Lib. ii. Dist. 39.; *Bonaventura*, Sent. Lib. ii. Dist. 29. Art. ii. Qu. 2; comp. Brev. iii. 25. Cent. ii. § 2; *Hugo of St. Victor*, de Sacram. Lib. i. p. 6; *Alexander Hales*, P. ii. Qu. 96: comp. Cramer, vii. p. 494 ss. Marheineke, Symbolik iii. p. 13 ss. On the contrary, the position of Thomas Aquinas (P. 1. Qu. 95. Art. 9.), that man, *prior* to the fall, had never been in the condition of the *pura naturalia*, but, from the moment of his creation, had possessed the *donum superadditum*, which belonged, therefore, properly to his very nature, was more nearly allied to the view of the later Protestant theologians. See *Cramer* and *Marheincke* l. c., and on the other side *Baur*, Symbolik, p. 34. [On *Anselm's* doctrine of the divine image, see *F. R. Hasse*, in Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theologie, 1835. On this whole distinction of pura naturalia and dona gratiæ see *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 576.]

[4] *John Damascenus* adhered to the distinction drawn by the Greek fathers, De Fide Orthod. ii. c. 12.—*Hugo of St. Victor*, De Sacram. Lib. i. P. c. 2. distinguished:.....Imago secundum *rationem*, similitudo secundum *dilectionem*, imago secundum *cognitionem veritatis*, similitudo secundum *amorem virtutis*, vel imago secundum *scientiam*, similitudo secundum *substantiam*....

...Imago pertinet ad *figuram*, similitudo ad *naturam*, etc. Hugo, however restricted the image of God to the soul, and decidedly excluded the body; for the passages, see *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 94, 95.—*Peter Lombard* made a somewhat different distinction (Sent. Lib. ii. Dist. 16. D.). by numbering the dilectio among those qualities which form the *image* (memoria, intelligentia et dilectio); he conceived the *resemblance* to God to consist in the innocentia et justitia, quæ in mente rationali naturaliter sunt. He also expressed himself more briefly thus: Imago consideratur in cognitione veritatis, similitudo in amore virtutis. In agreement with Hugo of St. Victor, he asserted, Imago pertinet ad formam, similitudo ad naturam.* [On the *Lombard's* views, see *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 509: he distinguished between the dona naturalia, and the dona gratiæ; the former consist in the purity and vigor of all the powers of the soul; left to himself, however, man could do only evil. The aid originally given to man he thus defines: Illud utique fuit libertas arbitrii ab omni labe et corruptela immunis atque voluntatis rectitudo et omnium naturalium potentiarum animæ sinceritas atque vivacitas. On *Aquinas* and *Alexander of Hales*, see Neander, p. 574, *sq.*]

First of all was man's dominion over the earth, and over the animal kingdom: *Thomas Aquinas*, P. i. Q. 96; *Cramer*, vii. p. 499, 500. Questions were raised, such as, would Adam have possessed *all* virtues, and in what manner, if he had not sinned? In what respect may he be said to have possessed, *e. g.*, modesty, since it did not exist until sin entered into the world? He did not possess it *actually*, but *habitually* (*i. e.*, he possessed the disposition to it). Did man, in his state of innocence, possess passions and affections? Yes, viz., such as refer to that which is good; they were, however, moderate and harmonious. Could one man have ruled over others? No; nevertheless a superiority of wisdom and righteousness might have existed, etc. The definitions of the earlier scholastics, such as *Anselm of Canterbury* (Cur Deus Homo II. 1., rationalis natura justa est facta, ut summo bono, *i. e.*, Deo fruendo beata esset), as well as of the mystics, both before and after the times of Thomas Aquinas, were simpler, or had, at least, regard rather to what is religious and moral. Thus, *Hugo of St. Victor* conceived the original excellency of man, in point of knowledge to consist, 1. In cognitione perfecta omnium visibilium; 2. In cognitione creatoris per præsentiam contemplationis seu per internam inspirationem; 3. In cognitione sui ipsius qua conditionem et ordinem et debitum suum sive supra se, sive in se, sive sub se non ignoraret; see *Liebner*, p. 410, note 61. In reference to the will of man, there existed, previous to his fall, two blessings, the one an earthly one, viz., the world; and the other a heavenly one, viz., God. The former was freely given to man, the latter he was to obtain by his own

* The mystics, and those preachers of the middle ages who held similar views, endeavored to point out the image of God in the outward form by the most singular illustrations. God, said *Berthold* (quoted by *Kling*, p. 305, 306., *Wackernagel* Lesebuch, p. 678.), has written under the eyes of man, that *he* has created him, "with flourishing letters." His two eyes correspond to the two letters o in the word homo. The curved eye-brows above, and the nose between the eyes, form the letter m; h is a mere accessory letter. The ear is the letter d, "beautifully circled and flourished;" the nostrils form a Greek ε, "beautifully circled and flourished;" the mouth forms an i, "beautifully circled and flourished," *All together form the phrase "homo Dei."*

merits. In order that man might retain the earthly blessing, and acquire the heavenly one, the præceptum naturæ was given him for the one, the præceptum disciplinæ (*i. e.*, the command not to eat the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil) for the other. He possessed the former by nature, but received the latter from without. Accordingly, man could guard against negligence (contra negligentiam), in respect to the external command, by using caution, and by his own reason; but God protected him against violence (contra violentiam). Compare *Gerson*, De Meditatione, Cons. 2, p. 449, ss. (quoted by *Hundeshagen*, p. 42): Fuit ab initio bene conditæ rationalis creaturæ talis ordo ordinisque tranquillitas, quod ad nutum et merum imperium sensualitas rationi inferiori et inferior ratio superiori serviebat. Et erat ab inferioribus ad superiora pronus et facilis ascensus, faciente hoc levitate originalis justitiæ subvehentis sursum corda.—In the writings of *John Wessel* we only meet with occasional and disconnected statements concerning the *original condition* of man; the profoundest and most important is in De Orat. xi. 3, p. 184 (quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 239); "In the state of innocence there existed a necessity for breathing, eating, and sleeping; and, to counteract the dissolution which threatened man, he was permitted to eat of the fruit of the tree of life;" *i. e.*, though man was subject to certain natural restrictions, he was, nevertheless, free from pressing wants, from the necessity of suffering, of disease, and death; for the partaking of the fruit of the tree of life secured his immortality.

[6] The statements of *Anselm* have more direct reference to the nature of the devil, but are also applicable to the will of *created beings* in general (*Hasse*, ii. 441), De Casu Diaboli, c. 2–6. *Hasse*, ii. 399, *sq.*

[7] *Hugo of St. Victor* assumed the existence of three or four kinds of liberty: 1. Man, in his *original state*, possessed the power to sin, and the power not to sin (posse peccare et posse non peccare); in this is included assistance to do good (adjutorium in bono), but an infirmity to do evil (infirmitas in malo), though in such a manner as neither to compel him to do good, nor forcibly to restrain him from evil. 2. In the *middle state of man* after* the fall the case is as follows:—*a*, *Prior* to his restoration (ante reparationem), man lacks the divine grace (assistance) to do good, and the infirmity to evil degenerates into a propensity to evil, *i. e.*, posse peccare et non posse non peccare. (Though the idea of liberty is not thereby entirely set aside, it is at least greatly weakened.) *After* his restoration (redemption), but *before* he is established in goodness, man possesses grace to do good, and infirmity to do evil, *i. e.*, posse peccare et posse non peccare (the former because of his liberty and infirmity, the latter because of his liberty and by means of assisting grace.) 3. In the *highest state of perfection*, there is both the possibility not to sin, and the impossibility of sinning (posse non peccare et non posse peccare), not because the liberty of the will, or the lowliness of nature, is abolished, but because man will never be deprived of confirming grace, which admits no sin; Cap. 16 (see *Liebner*, p. 403).—In the first condition God shares with man, in the second man shares with the devil, in the third God receives all: Cap. 10, ibid.—In *Raimund of Sabunde*, too, the ab-

* We here anticipate (for the sake of the connection, and to give all he says at once) points considered in the following sections, which are to be compared.

stract notion of (or destination to) freedom is distinguished from its actual use (connected with the distinction between the image of God, and resemblance to God, comp. note 4), Tit. 239: Item quia homo debuit ita formari, ut posset acquirere aliquid bonum, quod nondum sibi datum fuerat. Quamvis enim perfectus esset in natura, tamen nondum erat totaliter consummatus, quia aliquod majus adhuc habere poterat, sed non nisi voluntarie et non per violentiam....Si enim homo fuisset totaliter completus et transmutatus et consummatus in gloria, ut amplius nihil posset ei dari, jam per ipsum liberum arbitrium non posset aliquid lucrari nec mereri sibi. Et sic in natura hominis perfecta duo status sunt considerandi; scilicet status, in quo posset mereri et lucrari per ipsum liberum arbitrium, et status, in quo esset completus et consummatus in gloria; et sic est *status meriti* et *status præmii*. ....Et ideo convenientissimum fuit, quod Deus dedit homini occasionem merendi, nec in vanum esset creatus in statu merendi. Et quia nihil est magis efficax ad merendum, quam pura obedientia seu opus factum ex pura obedientia et mera....convenientissimum fuit, quod Deus daret præceptum homini, in quo pura obedientia appareret et exerceretur....Et quia magis apparet obedientia in præcepto negativo, quam affirmativo, ideo debuit esse illud mandatum prohibitivum magis quam affirmativum....Et ut homo maxime esset attentus ad servandum obedientiam et fugiendum inobedientiam, et firmiter constaret ei de voluntate Dei mandatis, conveniens fuit, ut Deus apponeret pœnam cum præcepto, et talem pœnam, qua non posset cogitari major, scilicet pœnam mortis. Comp. *Matzke*, Theol. des Raim. von Sabunde, 79.—*John Wessel* defined the liberty which man possessed in his original state, so as to ascribe to him the unlimited power of attaining and performing, without the assistance of others, or the influence of education, that which the idea of humanity implies, viz., such a perfection as elevated him to communion with God: see *Ullmann*, p. 240, 41.

§ 176.

THE FALL OF MAN, AND SIN IN GENERAL.

One of the leading questions, most debated, was, in what the fall of our first parents consisted? also, in what the nature of sin in general consists? Questions of secondary moment, such as, whether Adam's sin or Eve's were the greater? were only occasionally made the subject of discussion.[1] Even during the present period there were some, and towards its close *Agrippa of Nettersheim* in particular, who asserted that the sin of the first man consisted in the awakening of his carnal propensities, and who endeavored to establish their opinion by the aid of allegorical interpretation.[2] But the prevailing view of the church divines was, that the sin is not to be sought in one single act, but in the disobedience of man to God, which took its rise principally in pride.[3] After the example of Augustine, the definitions respecting the nature of sin were for the

most part negative.[4] *Hugo of St. Victor* endeavored to explain the nature of sin from the conflict of two tendencies in man, the one of which (appetitus justi) leads to God, the other (appetitus commodi) to the world. The latter propensity is not evil in itself, but the abandonment of the right medium is the cause of sin.[5] The mystics supposed sin to consist in this, that man, as a creature, strives to obtain independence; and the author of the work entitled "Deutsche Theologie," carried this notion so far as to say, that in this respect the fall of man is like that of the devil.[6] The further enumeration and classification of particular sins, their division into sins mortal and venial, belong rather to the history of ethics, than to that of doctrines.[7]

[1] *Anselm*, De Peccato Orig. c. 9. Though Eve first disobeyed the divine command, Adam, as the real father of the human race, is also the father of sin. Many of the reasons urged on either side, are to be found in the works of *Peter Lombard* (Lib. ii. Dist. 22), and *Thomas Aquinas*, P. ii. Qu. 163, Art. 4. *Bonaventura* (Brevil. iii. 3, 4) divides the guilt between the two, but says that the punishment was double in the case of the woman. On the contrary, according to *Agrippa of Nettersheim*, Adam sinned knowingly, Eve was only misled (Opp. T. ii. p. 528); see *Meiners* Biographie, p. 233. According to *Tauler* (Predigten, i. p. 61), theologians assert that we should have suffered no harm, if Eve alone had eaten of the fruit. Concerning the farther question of the scholastics, whether sin would have been communicated to Eve if Adam had transgressed the divine command *before* the creation of his wife, compare *Cramer*, vii. p. 534, ss. On the singular opinions of *Pulleyn*, see ib. vol. vi. p. 481, ss.

[2] Disputatio de Orig. Pecc. in Opp. T. ii. p. 553, ss., quoted by *Meiners*, l. c. p. 254, note 3 (he regarded the serpent as the membrum serpens, lubricum.) The opinion according to which sin consists in the first instance in sensuality was most decidedly opposed by *Anselm*, De Pecc. Orig. c. 4.: Nec isti appetitus, quos Ap. carnem vocat (Gal. v.)....justi vel injusti sunt per se considerandi. Non enim justum faciunt vel injustum sentientem, sed injustum tantum voluntate, cum non debet, consentientem. Non eos *sentire*, sed eis *consentire* peccatum est.

[3] *John Damascenus* De Fide Orth. ii. 30. (in calce): ὅθεν καὶ θεότητος ἐλπίδι ὁ ψεύστης δελεάζει τὸν ἄθλιον, καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἴδιον τῆς ἐπάρσεως ὕψος ἀναγαγὼν, πρὸς τὸ ὅμοιον καταφέρει τῆς πτώσεως βάραθρον.—According to *Anselm*, all self-will of the creature is an injury to the majesty of God (treason); De Fide Trin. cap. 5 (*Hasse*, ii. 306): Quicunque propria voluntate utitur, ad similitudinem Dei per rapinam nititur, et Deum propria dignitate et singulari excellentia privare, quantum in ipso est, convincitur.—*Peter Lombard*, Lib. ii. Dist. 22. *Thomas Aquinas*, P. ii. Qu. 163. Nevertheless sensuality (*i. e.*, the desire after the forbidden fruit) was also mentioned as a subordinate principle; see *Tauler's* Predigten i. p. 51, 79; *Cramer*, vii. p. 524.

[4] *John Damascenus*, Lib. ii. c. 30: Ἡ γὰρ κακία οὐδὲν ἕτερόν ἐστιν, εἰ

μὴ ἀναχώρησις τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ.—*John Scotus Erigena* looked upon sin from the negative point of view, by comparing it to a leprosy which infects humanity, but which is to be removed by divine grace (De Div. Nat. v. 5, p. 230), and then continues as follows: Magisque dicendum, quod ipsa natura quæ ad imaginem Dei facta est, suæ pulchritudinis vigorem integritatemque essentiæ *nequaquam* perdidit, neque perdere potest. Divina siquidem forma semper incommutabilis permanet; capax tamen corruptibilium pœna peccati facta est.... quicquid vero naturali corpori ex concretionibus elementorum et animæ ex sordibus irrationabilium motuum superadditum est, in fluxu et corruptione semper est. In his opinion, "*Sin is only a vanishing and self-abolishing element, and therefore has not the significancy of a moral act; Baur*, Versöhnungslehre, p. 135; Comp. also *Baur*, Trinitätslehre, ii. 305: "*Sin is to him not something accidental, originating in time, but original in creation and in human nature.*" (A view allied to pantheism).—On the other hand, *Abelard* (in his treatise Scito Teipsum), attaching particular importance to the act as performed with the conscious approval of the person acting, makes sin (formally) depend on the *intention* with which anything is done; see the extracts given by *De Wette*, Sittenlehre iii. p. 124, ss.—*Anselm's* definitions of sin are also of a negative character; Cur Deus Homo i. 11: Non est itaque aliud peccare, quam Deo non reddere debitum; De Conceptu Virginali c. 27: justitiæ debitæ nuditas; also in De Casu Diaboli, c. 1. See *Hasse*, ii. 394 sq. Münscher ed. by Von Cölln, i. p. 121, ss. [On *Abelard*, see *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 511.]

[5] According to *Hugo of St. Victor* (Lib. i. P. vi. c. 1–22, quoted by Liebner, p. 412, ss.), the first sin was the twofold disobedience to the law of nature and the law of discipline. Having laid that basis, he proceeds to a further scientific examination of the nature of sin. He supposed it to consist in the discord existing between the appetitus justi, and the appetitus commodi, both of which are innate. Man abandoning the right medium, desiring the higher good, rising above himself, and striving, in the pride and presumption of his heart, both to be equal to God, and to possess him before the appointed time, fell from his state of innocence. Thus it happened that he also lost the right medium in his desires after the inferior good; for as the mind of man, which held likewise the reins of the flesh, did not succeed in its higher efforts, and fell, as it were, out of the right medium, he abandoned also the reins of the flesh, and let it go without measure and precaution, in consequence of which, all external evils broke in upon him (transgressio superioris et inferioris appetitus.) The *former* loss was accordingly culpa, the *latter* both culpa and pœna; the one was a loss for the spirit, the other for the flesh, since man retained the irregular appetitus commodi without obtaining the commodum itself. Abandoning the appetitus justi, man lost at the same time the justitia, which is not only inseparable from it, but also consists in it; nothing was left to him but the unsatisfied appetitus commodi, which is here on earth a foretaste of hell, a necessitas concupiscendi, etc., c. 11–22. "*From what is said above, it follows that evil does not consist either in the object desired* (*for man always desires a good even in the concupiscentia*), *or in the act of desiring, in putting the faculty of desire into exercise* (*for it is a gift of God*), *but only in*

not keeping the proper medium in our desires," *Liebner* l. c. Hugo of St. Victor also endeavored to give an answer to the question, how the first sin could possibly have been committed by one who was created good? Adam could not have sinned, either nolens or volens. He only *ceased* to desire the good (justum velle desiit), c. 121. Conformed to this are his negative definitions, c. 16: Et ideo malum nihil est, cum id, quod esse deberet, non est; and Lib. i. P. v. c. 26: Peccatum nec substantia est, nec de substantia, sed privatio boni (See *Liebner*, p. 415).—Concerning the views of *Wessel* on the nature of sin (want of love) compare Ullmann, l. c. p. 241.

[6] Deutsche Theologie, cap. 2. "The Scriptures, faith and truth, say, that sin is only the turning of the creature from the unchangeable good to the changeable, *i. e.*, from the perfect to the imperfect and incomplete, and principally to himself. Now observe, when man puts himself in possession of anything that is good, or appropriates it as real being (*i. e.*, when he imagines that he has his being from himself, and when he wants to be something, while he is nothing); or as life (*i. e.*, when he imagines that he has life in himself); or as knowledge (*i. e.*, when he imagines that he knows much and can do much); in short, when he endeavors to obtain all that which is called good, imagining that he is the same, or that the same belongs to him, in all such cases he rebels against his nature. For what else did the devil, or what was his rebellion or his fall, if not that he thought himself something, and presumed to be something, and pretended that something belonged to him? This presumption to be something, his self-hood [*Ich*], (*i. e.*, his self-love), his me [*Mich*], (*i. e.*, his self-will), his to me [*Mir*], (*i. e.*, his self-esteem), and his mine [*Mein*], (*i. e.*, his own good), were, and are still, his rebellion and his fall." Cap. 3: "What else did Adam do than what Lucifer does? They say, that Adam fell and was lost, because he ate the apple. I say: He fell by accepting, assuming, or appropriating to himself that which belonged to God, viz., by his ego (*i. e.*, his self-love), by his me (*i. e.* his self-will), by his mine (*i. e.*, because of the good which he had usurped), and by his to me (*i. e.*, for his own honor, wisdom, etc.) *Though he had eaten seven apples*, if there had been no appropriation or assumption, he would not have fallen; as soon as he appropriated the apple as his, he fell, *even though he had never bitten it*."

[7] *De Wette*, christliche Sittenlehre iii. p. 147, ss. (after *Thomas Aquinas*.)

§ 177.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST SIN. ORIGINAL SIN. FREEDOM OF THE WILL.

The more intimate the supposed connection between the primitive state of man and the *justitia originalis*, the greater was the fall. The theologians of the Greek Church contented themselves with believing in a deterioration of the moral power of man, and retained the earlier notions concerning his liberty.[1] In the Western Church

almost all the schoolmen followed *Augustine*,[2] though some of them adopted opinions which, in many essential points, differed from his fundamental principles. Thus *Abelard*, among the earlier scholastics, understood by hereditariness of the first sin, not the sin itself, but its punishment.[3] Several of the later schoolmen also, especially *Duns Scotus* and his followers, manifested a leaning toward Semi-pelagianism, while *Thomas Aquinas* and his school adhered more strictly to the definitions of Augustine.[4] The mystics in general bewailed the entire depravity of the old man (Adam), but avoided indulging in subtile definitions.[5] And, lastly, the evangelical theologians, previous to the age of the Reformation, such as *John Wessel*, also looked upon the unregenerate as the children of wrath, though they made a distinction between the responsibility for original sin and for actual transgression.[6]

[1] *John of Damascus*, De Fide Orth. ii. c. 12, p. 178:* Ἐποίησε δὲ αὐτὸν φύσει ἀναμάρτητον καὶ θελήσει αὐτεξούσιον· ἀναμάρτητον δέ φημι, οὐχ ὡς μὴ ἐπιδεχόμενον ἁμαρτίαν (μόνον γὰρ τὸ θεῖον ἁμαρτίας ἐστὶν ἀνεπίδεκτον), ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐν τῇ φύσει τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν ἔχοντα, ἐν τῇ προαιρέσει δὲ μᾶλλον· ἤτοι ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντα μένειν καὶ προκόπτειν ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ, τῇ θείᾳ συνεργούμενον χάριτι, ὡσαύτως καὶ τρέπεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ κακῷ γίνεσθαι, τοῦ θεοῦ παραχωροῦντος διὰ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον. Οὐκ ἀρετὴ γὰρ τὸ βίᾳ γινόμενον. Comp. c. 22, p 187–88, c. 24, 27.....Further, c. 27, 194–95 : Εἰ δὲ τοῦτο, ἐξ ἀνάγκης παρυφίσταται τῷ λογικῷ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον· ἢ γὰρ οὐκ ἔσται λογικὸν, ἢ λογικὸν ὂν κύριον ἔσται πράξεων καὶ αὐτεξούσιον. Ὅθεν καὶ τὰ ἄλογα οὔκ εἰσιν αὐτεξούσια· ἄγονται γὰρ μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως, ἥτερ ἄγουσι· διὸ οὐδὲ ἀντιλέγουσι τῇ φυσικῇ ὀρέξει, ἀλλ' ἅμα ὀρεχθῶσί τινος, ὁρμῶσι πρὸς τὴν πρᾶξιν. Ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος, λογικὸς ὤν, ἄγει μᾶλλον τὴν φύσιν ἥπερ ἄγεται· διὸ καὶ ὀρεγόμενος, εἴπερ ἐθέλοι, ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἀναχαιτίσαι τὴν ὄρεξιν, ἢ ἀκολουθῆσαι αὐτῇ. Ὅθεν τὰ μὲν ἄλογα οὐδὲ ἐπαινεῖται, οὐδὲ ψέγεται· ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἐπαινεῖται καὶ ψέγεται. C. 30, p. 198 : (ὁ θεὸς) οὐ γὰρ θέλει τὴν κακίαν γίνεσθαι, οὐδὲ βιάζεται τὴν ἀρετήν. Notice the usage of *παρὰ φύσιν*, and *κατὰ φύσιν*, ibid. p. 100, and compare it with Augustine's usage of natura.—In his opinion, the effects of the fall consist in this, that man is θανάτῳ ὑπεύθυνος καὶ φθορᾷ καὶ πόνῳ καθυποβληθήσεται καὶ ταλαίπωρον ἕλκων βίον (ibid.) In the moral aspect man is γυμνωθεὶς τῆς χάριτος καὶ τὴν πρὸς θεὸν παῤῥησίαν ἀπεκδυσάμενος (Lib. iii. c. 1.) Comp. iv. 20.—John Damascenus was also followed by the rest of the Greek theologians, *Theodore Studita*, *Theophylactus*, *Euthymius Zigabenus*, *Nicetas Choniates*, and *Nicolas of Methone*. The views of the latter (taken from his Refut.) are given by *Ullmann*, l. c. p. 86, ss. He also laid great stress upon the freedom of the will, and held that the divine image was only obscured by the fall.

[2] Anselm expressed himself in very strict terms concerning the imputa-

* The passage in question refers, in the first instance, to the first man, but, as may be seen from the context, still admits of a general application in the case of all men.

tion of original sin, to the exclusion of all milder views, De Orig. Pecc. c. 3: Si vero dicitur originale peccatum non esse absolute dicendum peccatum, sed cum additamento *originale* peccatum, sicut pictus homo non vere homo est, sed vere est homo pictus, profecto sequitur: quia infans, qui nullum habet peccatum nisi originale, mundus est e peccato: nec fuit solus inter homines filius virginis in utero matris et nascens de matre sine peccato: et aut non damnatur infans, qui moritur sine baptismo, nullum habens peccatum præter originale, aut sine peccato damnatur. Sed *nihil horum accipimus*. Quare omne peccatum est injustitia, et originale peccatum est absolute peccatum, unde sequitur, quod est injustitia. Item si Deus non damnat nisi propter injustitiam, damnat autem aliquem propter originale peccatum: ergo non est aliud originale peccatum, quam injustitia. Quod si ita est, originale peccatum non est aliud quam injustitia, *i. e.*, absentia debitæ justitiæ, etc.—Nevertheless it is not the sin of Adam as such, but man's *own* sin which is imputed to him, c. 25: Quapropter cum damnatur infans pro peccato originali, damnatur non pro peccato Adæ, sed pro suo; nam si ipse non haberet suum peccatum, non damnaretur.—He opposed the theory of the *material* propagation of sin (by traducianism) in what follows, c. 7. (compare above, § 173, note 4): Sicut in Adam omnes peccavimus, quando ille peccavit: non quia tunc peccavimus ipsi, qui nondum eramus, sed quia de illo futuri eramus, et tunc facta est illi necessitas, ut cum essemus, peccaremus (Rom. 5). Simili modo de immundo semine, "in iniquitatibus et in peccatis concipi" potest homo intelligi, non quod in semine sit immunditia peccati, aut peccatum sive iniquitas; sed quia ab ipso semine et ipsa conceptione, ex qua incipit homo esse, accipit necessitatem, ut cum habebit animam rationalem, habeat peccati immunditiam, quæ non est aliud quam peccatum et iniquitas. Nam etsi ex vitiosa concupiscentia semine generetur infans, non tamen magis est in semine culpa, quam est in sputo vel in sanguine, si quis mala voluntate exspuit aut de sanguine suo aliquid emittit, non enim sputum aut sanguis, sed mala voluntas arguitur.)*—On the question how far all men have sinned *in* Adam? compare ch. 1 and 2, and ch. 21, 22. Anselm also thought that there was a kind of mutual action between original sin, and personal sin, c. 26: Sicut persona propter naturam peccatrix nascitur: ita natura propter personam magis peccatrix redditur.—Concerning *the mode of the propagation of sin*, viz., whether it is communicated in the first instance to the soul, or to the body, etc., the scholastics differed in their opinions. Comp. *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 132; especially the opinion of *Peter Lombard*, Lib. ii. Dist. 31: [In concupiscentia et libidine concipitur caro formanda in corpus prolis. Unde caro ipsa quæ concipitur in vitiosa concupiscentia polluitur et corrumpitur: ex cujus contactu anima cum infunditur maculam trahit qua

* Anselm would not have admitted the force of the argument frequently urged in favor of the doctrine of original sin, viz, that certain moral dispositions, which may be called hereditary sins, are propagated like certain physical disorders, inasmuch as he taught, c. 23 (in connection with what has been said above), that *only* the sin of Adam is transmitted to his posterity, but not that of parents to their children. His reasoning was quite logical, because the idea of original sin would otherwise become too relative! Concerning the relation of Anselm's theory to the later Lutheran (Flacian?) see *Möhler*, Kleine Schriften, i. p. 167.

polluitur et fit rea, id est vitium concupiscentiæ, quod est originale peccatum. Pet. Lomb. Sent. lib. ii. Dist. 31, Litt. C.]—Some of the later theologians, adhering to Augustine and Anselm, taught similar views, *e. g.*, *Savonarola*; Quid autem est peccatum originale, nisi privatio justitiæ originalis? Ideo homo, conceptus et natus in hujusmodi peccato, totus obliquus est, totus curvus.... Peccatum itaque originale radix est omnium peccatorum, fomes enim omnium iniquitatum: Medit. in Psalm. p. 17, quoted by *Meier*, Savonarola, p. 269. [Anselm wrote a treatise De libero Arbitrio, taking the ground that liberty does not consist in freedom of choice—as this will not apply to God and the blessed spirits: as we advance in virtue the possibility of sinning diminishes. His definition is: Arbitrium potens servare rectitudinem voluntatis propter ipsam rectitudinem. Yet Anselm does not assert the total loss of freedom by the fall: De lib. Arb. cap. 3: Licet peccato se subdidissent, libertatem tamen arbitrii naturalem in se interimere nequiverunt. So too *Bernard*, Gratia et lib. Arbitrium, c. 8: Manet post peccatum liberum arbitrium; etsi miserum, tamen integrum. Et quod se per se homo non sufficit excutere a peccato sive miseria, non liberi arbitrii signat destructionem sed duarum reliquarum privationem. So the *Lombard*, II. Dist. 25: Corrupta est ergo libertas arbitrii per peccatum et ex parte perdita.... Ecce liberum arbitrium dicit [scil. Augustinus] hominem amisisse: non quia post peccatum non habuerit liberum arbitrium sed quia libertatem arbitrii perdidit: non quidem omnem sed libertatem a miseria et a peccato.—*Abelard* says that freedom is the power of doing what we decide to be according to reason. Comp. *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 525, on the Relation of Grace and Freedom.]

[3] Since Abelard maintained that the free consent of man was necessary to constitute sin (§ 176, note 4), he could not speak of sin, in the proper sense of the word, in the case of new-born infants; yet he did not feel disposed to deny original sin altogether. He therefore took the word "sin" in a twofold sense, applying it to the punishment, as well as to sin itself. Infants have a part only in the former, but not in the latter. Nor did Abelard see how unbelief in Christ could be imputed to infants, or to those to whom the gospel is not announced: Scito te ipsum, c. 14 (quoted by *de Wette*, Sittenlehre, iii. p. 131). He also praised the virtues of the better part of the Greeks, especially of the philosophers, in particular of the Platonists; Theol. Christ. ii. p. 1211; compare above § 158, note 2. *Neander*, der heilige Bernhard, p. 125.

[4] This difference is connected with the one above alluded to concerning the original state of man (§ 175). As the justitia originalis, according to *Duns Scotus*, was not so intimately united with the nature of man, as Thomas Aquinas supposed, the loss of the supernatural gifts was less great, and might take place without such painful rupture as human nature must undergo, in the strict Augustinian view: see Sent. Lib. ii. Dist. 29. On the other hand, *Thomas Aquinas* expressed himself as follows: Summ. P. ii. 1, Qu. 85, Art. 3 (quoted by *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 134); Per justitiam originalem perfecte ratio continebat inferiores animæ vires, et ipsa ratio perficiebatur a Deo et subjecta. Hæc autem originalis justitia subtracta est per peccatum primi parentis.....et ideo omnes vires animæ remanent quodammodo destitutæ proprio ordine, quo naturaliter ordinantur ad virtutem,

et ipsa destitutio *vulneratio naturæ* dicitur. Comp. *Bonaventura* Brevil. iii. 6, ss.

[s] Deutsche Theologie, c. 14: "He who lives a selfish life, and according to the old man, is, and may justly be called, the child of Adam; even if he have sunk so deep, as to be the child and brother of the devil.....All who follow Adam in his disobedience are dead, and can be made alive only in Christ, *i. e.*, by obedience. As long as a man is Adam, and Adam's child, he is his ownself, and lives without God.....Hence it follows, that all the children of Adam are dead in respect to God.....We shall never repent of sin, nor commence a better life, until we return to obedience.....Disobedience is sin itself," etc.

[t] *Wessel*, De Magnit. Pass. c. 59, and other passages quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 244.—*Savonarola* taught in a similar manner concerning the posterity of Adam: rationem culpæ non habent, reatu non carent. (Triumph. Cruc. Lib. iii. c. 9. p. 280, ss. quoted by Meier, p. 261.)

Besides original sin, there were yet other effects of the fall (such as death and other evils), which had before this been made prominent by the early church, and to which even a greater importance was attached, on account of their connection with the imputation of sin. Death itself did not actually enter into the world till later, but *mortality* came at the same time with sin. On the question, in how far God may be said to have been the author of death? etc., see *Cramer*, vii. p. 528. According to *Scotus Erigena*, the distinction of the sexes is the effect of sin; De Div. Nat. ii. 5, p. 49: Reatu suæ prævaricationis obrutus, naturæ suæ divisionem in masculum et fœminam est passus et.....in pecorinam corruptibilemque ex masculo et fœmina numerositatem justo judicio redactus est.

§ 178.

EXCEPTION TO THE UNIVERSAL CORRUPTION OF MANKIND. THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE VIRGIN.

Labonlaye, die Frage der unbefleckten Empfängniss, Berl., 1854. *Jul. Müller*, in the Deutsche Zeitschrift f. christl. Wissenschaft, vi. 1. **Passaglia*, De Immaculato Deiparæ semper Virginis Conceptu. 3 Tom. Rom., 1854–5. [*J. Perrone*, De Immacul. B. V. Mariæ Conceptu, Rom., 1848. *Jo. Lannoii*, Opera Omnia Præscriptiones de Concept. B. Mar. Virginis, 1676, in Opera i. 1. *Lambruschini*, on Imm. Conc. transl. New York, 1855. Abbé *Laborde*, Impossibility of Imm. Conc. transl. Phil., 1855. *Passaglia*, (as above) in French version, 4 Tom., 1855. *H. Denzinger*, Die Lehre d. unbefleckt. Emp., 2d ed., 1855. Syllogo Monument. ad Mysterium Conc. Immac. Virg., cura Ant. Ballerini, Rom., 1855. *Mgr. J. B. Malon* (Bruges) L'immaculée Conc. de la bienheureuse Vièrge. 2, 8vo, Bruxelles, 1857. Articles on the dogma, Christ. Remembrancer, 1852 and 1858; Methodist Quarterly (New York), 1855; Church of Eng. Quarterly, 1855; Brownson's Quarterly, 1859.]

The earlier notion, advanced not only by the heretic Pelagius, but also by the orthodox Athanasius, according to which some individuals had remained free from the general corruption, was not likely longer to receive countenance.[1] It was only the Virgin, who

having long been elevated above the lot of humanity by an excessive adoration (the *Hyperdulia*), was to share the privilege of her son Jesus, viz., to appear as sinless on the page of history; although theologians of repute, raised their voices against such a doctrine.[2] In the course of the twelfth century, the dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin gained great authority, in the first instance in France. But when the canons of Lyons instituted (A. D. 1140) a particular festival in honor of that doctrine, by which a new Lady-day was added to those already in existence, *Bernard of Clairval*, clearly perceiving that thus the specific difference between our Saviour and the rest of mankind was in danger of being set aside, strongly opposed both the new doctrine and the festival.[3] *Albert the Great*, *Bonaventura*, *Thomas Aquinas*, and with him the order of the Dominicans in general, were also zealous in opposition.[4] On the other hand, the Franciscan monk, *Duns Scotus*, endeavored to refute their objections, and to demonstrate, by subtile reasoning, that the superiority of the Redeemer, so far from being lessened, was augmented, by supposing that he himself was the cause of this righteousness in the nature of Mary; yet even Scotus only maintained, that the immaculate conception was the more probable among the different opinions.[5] The church hesitated for a long time without coming to a decision.[6] Pope Sextus IV. at last got out of the difficulty by confirming the festival of the immaculate conception, while he declared, that the doctrine itself should not be called heretical, and allowed those who differed to retain their own views.[7] Of course the controversy did not come to an end, especially as the tendency of the age was rather favorable to the dogma.

[1] Thus *Anselm*, De Pecc. Orig. drew a distinct line between the birth of John the Baptist (which was relatively miraculous, but did not, on that account, render him sinless), and the incarnation of the Redeemer (which excluded original sin). Sanctification (*i. e.*, the being made holy) in the mother's womb, does not exclude original sin; and this is so specially noted to avoid confusion in the matter. So it could be, and was, assumed, that Mary was free from *actual* sin, without being delivered from original sin. See *Gieseler*, Dogmengesch. 553 sq. *Julius Müller*, loc. cit. p. 6. [Meth. Qu. Review, ubi supra.]

[2] Concerning the worship of the Virgin in general, see § 188 on the worship of saints.—The controversy on the immaculate conception was preceded by that carried on between *Paschasius Radbert* and *Ratramn*, concerning the virginity of Mary. Comp. § 179, toward the end (on Christology). *Radbert* had already maintained that Mary was sanctificata in utero matris (in d'Achery Spic. Tom. i. p. 46); but it is difficult to define precisely what he understood by that expression (compare the following note). It was, however, not only the worship of the Virgin as such, which led to the supposition of her immaculate conception, but this seemed a necessary inference

from other doctrinal premises. Theologians as acute as the scholastics could not but be aware, that, in order to explain the miracle of Christ's sinlessness on physical grounds, it was not sufficient to assert that man had no part in his generation; for as long as his mother was supposed to be stained with original sin, it was impossible to deny that she had part therein, unless they had recourse (after the manner of the Docetæ, and the Valentinians, in particular), to a mere birth *διὰ σωλῆνος* (comp. vol. i. § 65.). *Anselm* endeavored to avoid this difficulty, by leaving the physical aspect of original sin more or less out of question (comp. the preceding §), De Pecc. Orig. c. 8 and c. 11. He also concedes unreservedly, that even a *sinful* mother might have conceived a Redeemer without sin. Yet still he considers it fitting (decens erat) that Mary should be purified from sin, before the Saviour of the world was conceived in her: De Concep. Virg. cap. 18, and Cur Deus Homo, ii. 16: *Boso* here declares decidedly *against* the immaculate conception; Virgo tamen ipsa, unde assumtus est, est in iniquitatibus concepta, et in peccatis concepit eam mater ejus, et cum originali peccato nata est, quoniam et ipsa in Adam peccavit, in quo omnes peccaverunt. To this Anselm replies: Virgo autem illa, de quo ille homo (Christus) assumtus est, fuit de illis, qui ante nativitatem ejus per eum mundati sunt a peccatis, et in *ejus ipsa munditia* de illa assumta est. Comp. the conclusion of chap. 16: Quoniam matris munditia, per quam mundus est, non fuit nisi ab illo, *ipse quoque per se ipsum et a se mundus fuit.* And chap. 17.....per quam (scil. mortem Jesu Christi) et illa virgo, de qua natus est, et alii multi mundati sunt a peccato. Comp. *Hasse*, ii. 461, 556. *Müller* ubi supra, 12 (with reference to the interpretation of the passage by Gabriel Biel, Sent. lib. iii. Dist. 3, qu. 1).

[3] *Bernardi*, Ep. 174, ad Canonicos Lugdunenses, quoted by *Giesele*r ii. 490; *Münscher*, edit. by *Von Cölln*, p. 136; *Laboulaye*, l. c. p. 16. *He*, too, admitted that Mary was sanctified in the womb (as Paschasius taught), but he did not draw from that doctrine the inference that she was free from original sin (quatenus adversus originale peccatum hæc ipsa sanctificatio valuerit, non temere dixerim), and continues as follows: Etsi quibus vel paucis filiorum hominum datum est cum sanctitate *nasci*, non tamen et *concipi*, ut uni sane servaretur sancti prærogativa conceptus, qui omnes sanctificaret, *sclusque absque peccato veniens* purgationem faceret peccatorum, etc. [*Peter Lombard*, Liber Sent. iii. Dist. 3, sq., says of the flesh of Mary, which our Lord assumed, that "it was previously obnoxious to sin, like the other flesh of the Virgin, but cleansed by the operation of the Holy Spirit." "The Holy Ghost, coming into Mary, cleansed her from sin." *Alexander of Hales*, Summa, Pars iii. qu. 2, membr. 2, Art. 1, 4: "It was necessary that the blessed Virgin in her generation should contract sin from her parents;" "she was sanctified in the womb." Perrone attempts to set aside these opinions, and that of Aquinas and others (below), by the position that these mediæval doctors refer to the first, or active conception (the marital act), and not to the second conception (the infusion of the soul). But Aquinas says, that the infusion of grace is "after the infusion of the soul;" and that "before the infusion of the soul the Virgin was not sanctified;" and Alexander of Hales

and Bonaventura have similar statements. On the views of *Peter de la Celle*, bishop of Chartres, see *Neander*, Hist. Dogmas, 512.]

[4] *Albert Mag.* Sent. Lib. iii. Dist. 3. *Thomas Aquinas*, Summ. P. iii. Qu. 27. Art. 2, affirms a sanctification in the womb [sanctificata, and not sancta], but only after the fructifying of the embryo. But the lust of sin is not thereby wholly destroyed—secundum essentiam, which was the case only in the conception of Christ himself, yet the concupiscence is restrained —quoad exercitium et operationem. Only later, when Christ was conceived, did the holiness of what she bore work also upon the mother, wholly annulling the bias to sin. Comp. *Gieseler*, Dogmengesch. 560; *Jul. Müller*, l. c. —*Bonaventura*, too, with all his enthusiastic veneration for Mary, did not consider her free from original sin: Sent. lib. iii. Dist. 3. Art. 1, qu. 2: Teneamus secundum quod communis opinio tenet, Virginis sanctificationem fuisse *post* originalis peccati contractionem (*Münscher*, *Von Cölln*, ii. 136 sq.)

[5] In Sent. Lib. iii. Dist. 3. Qu. 1. and Dist. 18. Qu. 1. (quoted by *Gieseler*); see Schröckh, Kirchengesch. xxxiii. p. 362, ss. *Cramer*, vii. p. 567, ss. *Scotus* takes his departure from the different possibilities: Deus *potuit* facere quod ipsa nunquam fuisset in peccato originali; *potuit* etiam fecisse, ut tantum in uno instanti esset in peccato; *potuit* etiam facere ut per tempus aliquod esset in peccato et in ultimo illius temporis purgaretur. And then he finds it *probable* to attribute to her the most excellent of these possibilities, according to the argumentum congruentiæ seu decentiæ. See *Laboulaye*, l. c. 22. Scotus at any rate expressed himself with reserve, and even the Franciscans did not at first receive the doctrine unconditionally.—*Alvarus Pelagius* (about A. D. 1330) calls it—nova et phantastica. But soon the jealousy of the Orders mingled in the controversy, and even visions on both sides were brought to support and refute the dogma. Thus St. Bridget (about A. D. 1370) testified *for* the doctrine, and St. Catherine of Siena, as a member of the St. Dominic order, had visions *against* it.

[6] See Gieseler l. c. p. 501. The festival spread, although the council of Oxford (A. D. 1222) pronounced against its necessity. In the 13th century it was widely observed, but only as the festum *conceptionis* in general, and not as the festum conceptionis *immaculatæ*; see the explanation of it in Durantis Rationale Div. Offic. libr. vii. c. 7, in *Gieseler*, Dogmengesch. 559. [Durant says, that it was not celebrated on account of the immaculate conception, for this was not the case; but because the mother of the Lord had conceived. *Aquinas* however vindicates the festival as including a reference to the sanctity of Mary, but on the ground, that the time of her sanctification could not be accurately assigned; and he opposes the immaculate conception itself, as derogatory to the dignity of Christ.] At the Paris council (1387) the Spanish Dominican *John de Montesono* maintained, that it was *against* the faith to assume that original sin did not embrace all men, Mary included. But the University condemned this position, as well as others of this divine. Still more definite than the Paris synod was that of Basle, in favor of the dogma, Sess. xxxvi. (A. D. 1439, Sept. 17th) in Harduini Concc. T. viii. Col. 1266: Nos.....doctrinam illam disserentem gloriosam virginem Dei genitricem Mariam, præveniente et operante divini numinis gratia

singulari, nunquam actualiter subjacuisse originali peccato, sed immunem semper fuisse ab omni originali et actuali culpa sanctamque et immaculatam, tamquam piam et consonam cultui ecclesiastico, fidei catholicæ, rectæ rationi et sacræ scripturæ, ab omnibus catholicis approbandum fore, tenendam et amplectendam diffinimus et declaramus, nullique de cætero licitum esse in contrarium prædicare seu docere. (The celebration of the festival was fixed upon December 8th.) The Dominicans, however, adhered to their opposition; thus particularly the Dominican *Torquemada* (Turrecremata). The decrees of Basle could not be considered as binding, because this council was held to be schismatical; and it was the very men who guided that council, as *D'Ailly* and *Gerson*, who maintained the new dogma. Even at the council of Constance Gerson proposed to introduce also a festival in honor of the immaculate conception of St. Joseph! (Müller, ubi supra, p. 8). [On the introduction of the festival and the Paris decree, see Meth. Quarterly, as above, p. 280–82.]

[7] See the bulls of Pope Sixtus IV., dated Febr. 27th, A. D. 1474, and Sept. 4th, A. D. 1483 (Grave minus) in Extravagant. Comm. Lib. iii. Tit. 12. Cap. 1. and 2. (quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by *Von Cölln*, pp. 168, 169.) Comp. *Gieseler*, iii. p. 387.

[8] Even some of those who afterward espoused the cause of the Reformation, were *zealous advocates* of the doctrine in question, such as *Manuel*, a poet of Berne, who wrote on the occasion of the scandalous affair of Jetzer: compare his "Lied von der reinen unbefleckten Empfängniss" in the work of *Grüneisen*, Nic. Manuel, p. 297, ss., where he also quotes the fathers as authorities, even Anselm and Thomas Aquinas*, and then proceeds thus:

Auch miltigklich
und sicherlich
der christen mensch das glæubet,
das gott d' herr,
on widersperr,
seyn mutter hat bedawet (begabet)
mit heiligkeit,
gnadrich erfreit,
sunst wer sye vndg'legen
sein zorn ins teufels pflegen,
daz nit mocht seyn,
d' lilien reyn,

---

* Anselmus mer,
in seyner leer,
von dir hat schön betrachtet.
Er haltet nit
liebhabers sitt,
der deyn hoch fest verachtet,
das dich gantz clor
eert preisst fürwor,
empfange on all sünde.
etc.

Thomas Aquin
halt von dir fin,
du seysst die reinst uff erden,
on schuld und sünd,
für Adams kind,
gefreyet billich werden,
in der täglich,
auch nicht tödtlich,
keyn erbsünd mocht beliben.
Desgleichen thund auch scriben
Scotus subtil,
d' lerer vil,
die schul Paris,
mit grossem fliss,
zu Basel ists beschlossen.
Die kristlich kilch,
mit bistumb glich,
halt das gantz unverdrossen.

von dorn behut,
hellischer flut.
In ewigkeit bestandtlich
bistu allein,
christliche ein,
behalten hast gar trewlich.
Die sunn ihr schein
offt leytet ein
in unflätiges kote,
belibt doch keck
on mass und fleck
in ihrer schön on note.

Auch gold on luft,
in erdes cluft,
wechst unverseret glantze.
Also beleib auch gantze
Maria hoch
on erbsund boch (poch—doch)
an sel und leib,
vors teufels streyt
und gottes zorn gefreyet.
Göttlicher gwalt
in ihr heym stalt,
und sye vor unfal weyhet, etc.

FOURTH DIVISION.

CHRISTOLOGY AND SOTERIOLOGY.

§ 179.

THE GREEK CHURCH ON CHRISTOLOGY. THE ADOPTION CONTROVERSY IN THE WEST. NIHILIANISM.

* *Dorner*, Entwickelungsgeschichte der Christologie, p. 106, ss., *Walch*, *Ch. G. F.*, Historia Adoptianorum. Gott. 1755–58. *Frobenii* Dissertatio Historica de Hæresi Elipandi et Felicis (in his edition of the Works of Alcuin, T. i. p. 923, ss.) [*Christlieb*, John Scotus Erigena, 330–361.]

After the Monothelite controversy had been brought to a close in the East, no further objections were there raised against the church doctrine of *two natures and two wills in one and the same person.* But, in the course of the controversy respecting images, the question, whether it was right to represent Christ in a bodily form, gave rise to a renewed discussion concerning the relation of the divine to the human nature. *John Damascenus*, in particular, endeavored to reconcile the doctrine of two natures and two wills, with the unity of person, by regarding the divine nature as that which constitutes the person, and by illustrating the mutual relation in which the two natures stand to each other, through the use of the phrases τρόπος ἀντιδόσεως and περιχώρησις.[1] The Greek theologians in general adopted his views.[2]—The orthodox doctrine was again endangered by the *Adoption* interpretation of the Sonship of Christ, advanced by several Spanish bishops, especially *Elipandus of Toledo*, and *Felix of Urgella*, whom *Alcuin* and others successfully combated. The adoption theory, by making a distinction between an adopted son and a natural one, leaned toward Nestorianism, though its peculiar modifications admitted a milder interpretation.[3] *Peter Lombard's* view, that the Son of God did *not become anything* by the assumption of human nature (because no change can take place in the divine nature), was branded as the heresy of *Nihilianism*, though he advanced it without any evil intention, and was falsely interpreted as if he meant that Christ had become *nothing*.[4] *Albert the Great*, and *Thomas Aquinas*, endeavored to develop the christological doctrines of the church in a dialectic method.[5] But alongside of this dialectic scholasticism,

there was constantly found, as its supplement, a mystical, and moral tendency of a practical character. Some of this class despised all the subtile reasonings of the schools, while others, partly adopting them, regarded Christ, as it were, as the divine representative, or the restored prototype, of humanity.[6] On the contrary, the false mystics transformed the historical Christ into a mere ideal.[7]

[1] *John of Damascus*, De Fide Orth. iii. c. 2, ss. p. 205: Οὐ γὰρ προϋποστάσῃ καθ' ἑαυτὴν σαρκὶ ἠνώθη ὁ θεῖος λόγος, ἀλλ'.....αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος, γενόμενος τῇ σαρκὶ ὑπόστασις ὥστε ἅμα σὰρξ, ἅμα θεοῦ λόγου σὰρξ, ἅμα σὰρξ ἔμψυχος, λογική τε καὶ νοερά· διὸ οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀποθεωθέντα λέγομεν, ἀλλὰ θεὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα. Ὧν γὰρ φύσει τέλειος θεὸς, γέγονε φύσει τέλειος ἄνθρωπος ὁ αὐτὸς, κ. τ. λ. Concerning the terms τρόπος ἀντιδόσεως (communicatio idiomatum), and περιχώρησις (immeatio), see ch. 3 and 4, p. 210: Καὶ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τρόπος τῆς ἀντιδόσεως, ἑκατέρας φύσεως ἀντιδιδούσης τῇ ἑτέρᾳ τὰ ἴδια διὰ τὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως ταυτότητα, καὶ τὴν εἰς ἄλληλα αὐτῶν περιχώρησιν. Κατὰ τοῦτο δυνάμεθα εἰπεῖν περὶ Χριστοῦ, Οὗτος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συνανεστράφη· καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος ἄκτιστός ἐστι καὶ ἀπαθὴς καὶ ἀπερίγραπτος. Compare also the subsequent chapters, and Dorner, p. 106, ss. [and 259, *sq.* *Baur*, Dogmengesch. 211, says of John of Damasc., that in his view, the human nature of Christ is not a hypostasis by itself, and yet it is not without a hypostasis as far as it exists in the hypostasis of the Logos; it is human nature only as it exists before individual and personal being.]

[2] Thus *Nicetas Choniates* (Thesaurus, c. 16, quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 46), and *Nicolas of Methone* (Refut. p. 155, quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 84.) The latter, in accordance with the *communicatio idiomatum*, called the body of Christ, *σῶμα θεῖον*, because, by means of the rational and spiritual soul, it was united with the God Logos, so as to form one person, and was thus deified (*θεουργηθέν*.) Compare Refut. p. 166 (*Ullmann*, l. c).—Among the western theologians *Anselm* adopted these definitions in his Cur Deus Homo ii. c. 7.

[3] On the progress of the Adoption controversy, see *Walch*, l. c. Ketzerhistorie, vol. ix. p. 667, ss.; *Gieseler*, Church Hist. ii. 75, ss; *Neander* (Torrey's transl.) iii. 156, ss.—On the questions, whether Adoptionism had been propounded by earlier theologians? whether the correct reading of Hilary de Trin. ii. 29, is adoptatur or adoratur? and concerning the Liturgia Mozarabica, see *Gieseler*, l. c. On the earlier controversy of Elipandus with the Spanish bishop, Megetius, see *Baur*, Lehre d. Dreieinigkt. ii. 131, *sq.* [*Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 442, *sq.*, traces Adoptionism to the influence of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, of whom Felix was a diligent student. This is confirmed, adds *Jacobi* (in a note to Neander, p. 443), by the Commentaries on Paul's Epistle, published by *Pitra*, in his Spicileg. Solesmense, i. 170, *sq.*, as a work of Hilary, but really written by Theodore. Rabanus Maurus seems to have made use of these Commentaries. *Baur*, Dogmengesch. 213, says, that Adoptionism was the logical result of the Christological maxim, with which Alcuin opposed them: viz., that in the assumption of flesh by deity, "persona perit hominis non natura."] The

notion itself is most distinctly set forth in the Epist. Episcop. Hispan. ad Episc. Galliæ (in Alcuini Opp. T. ii. p. 568), quoted by *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 81, and *Gieseler*. Nos.....confitemur et credimus, Deum Dei filium ante omnia tempora sine initio ex Patre genitum—non adoptione sed genere, neque gratia sed natura—pro salute vero humani generis in fine temporis ex illa intima et ineffabili Patris substantia egrediens, et a Patre non recedens, hujus mundi infima petens, ad publicum humani generis apparens, invisibilis visibile corpus adsumens de virgine, ineffabiliter per integra virginalia matris cnixus: secundum traditionem patrum confitemur et credimus, cum factum ex muliere, factum sub lege, *non genere esse filium Dei,* sed adoptione, neque natura sed gratia*, id ipsum eodem Domino attestante, qui ait: "Pater major me est," etc.—*Felix* (apud Alcuin, contra Felic. lib. iv. c. 2): Secundo autem modo *nuncupative* Deus dicitur, etc. "*This union of the human nature, which is mean in itself, with the divine, by the elevation of the former in consequence of a divine judgment, may be called the unio forensis, or the legal union.*" Dorner, p. 112. On the comparison which may be drawn between the said elevation, and the *vioθεσία* of the redeemed, see *Baumgarten-Crusius*, p. 381. Even in Spain, the priest *Beatus*, of the province of Libana, and bishop *Etherius*, of Othma, pronounced against the Adoption theory. Felix was compelled to retract, first at Ratisbon (A. D. 792), and afterwards at Rome; the Synod of Frankfort (A. D. 794), also pronounced against Adoptionism.—Respecting Alcuini Libellus adversus Hæresin Felicis, ad Abbates et Monachos Gothiæ missus (T. i. p. 759, ss.), and his Epistola ad Felicem, compare Gieseler, p. 77. Alcuin's principal argument was, that the doctrine in question would destroy the *unity* of the Son of God, p. 763: Si igitur Dominus Christus secundum carnem, sicut quidam improba fide garriunt, adoptivus est Filius, nequaquam unus est Filius, quia nullatenus proprius Filius et adoptivus Filius unus esse potest Filius, quia unus verus et alter non verus esse dignoscitur. Quid Dei omnipotentiam sub nostram necessitatem prava temeritate constringere nitimur? Non est nostræ mortalitatis lege ligatus; omnia enim quæcumque vult, Dominus facit in cœlo et in terra. Si autem voluit ex virginali utero proprium sibi creare filium, quis ausus est dicere, cum non posse? etc. Comp. p. 813. At the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle (A. D. 799), *Felix* was induced to yield by Alcuin, while *Elipandus* persisted. Felix died A. D. 818, but he seems before his death to have returned to his former opinions; see Agobardi Liber adversus Dogma Felicis Episc. Urgellensis ad Ludov. Pium Imp.: comp. *Baur*, ii. 133.—*Folmar*, canon at Traufenstein, who lived in the 12th century, was charged (A. D. 1160) with similar Adoption (Nestorian?) errors; see *Cramer*, vii. p. 43. And *Duns Scotus* and *Durandus a. S. Porciano* admitted the use of

* No son, says Felix (ubi supra) can have two natural fathers. Christ, now, in his human nature is the son of David, as well as the Son of God. Consequently he can be the latter only by adoption, since he is the former by nature.—A subordinate question was this—When did this adoption take place? already at birth, or first at baptism? According to *Walch* (Ketzerhistorie, ix. 574, *sq.*), Felix maintained the latter: see in reply *Neander*, ubi supra, and compare *Baur*, Trinit. ii. 139. According to the representation of the latter, the relation of adoption was fully realized only in the resurrection of Christ.

the phrase *filius adoptivus* under certain restrictions. *Walch*, l. c. p. 253; *Gieseler*, ii. 80; *Baur*, ii. 838.

[4] Concerning the heresy of Nihilianism (*Lombardi* Sent. Lib. iii. Dist. 5–7, his language is not very definite), see *Cramer*, vol. vii. at the commencement; *Dorner*, p. 121, ss.; *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, pp. 86, 87; and *Gieseler*, Dogmengesch. 506, *sq.* In compliance with an order issued by Pope Alexander III., the phrase, "Deus non factus est aliquid" was examined by the Synod of Tours (A. D. 1163), and rejected: *Mansi*, Tom. xxii. p. 239. It was also opposed by *John Cornubiensis*, about the year 1175 (*Martène* Thesaurus, T. v. p. 1658, ss)* But it was principally *Walter of St. Victor*, who made it appear that the language of Peter Lombard implied the heretical notion: Deus est nihil secundum quod homo. "*The charge of Nihilianism is at least in so far unjust, as it represents the denial of existence in a certain individual form, as an absolute denial of existence. At all events, the attacks made upon Peter Lombard were among the reasons why theologians were henceforth more anxious to avoid the denial of the separate existence of the human nature of Christ. We meet, at least, in the writings of almost all the subsequent scholastics, with some passage or other, in which they urge, in opposition to the phrase 'non aliquid,' used by Peter Lombard, that the human nature of Christ is something definite, and distinct from all others, but yet subsisting only in the divine person; hence they would not call it either individual, or person.*" *Dorner*, pp. 122, 123. *Baur*, ii. 563.

[5] *Albertus Magn.* Compend. Theol. Lib. iv. de Incarnatione Christi c. 14, and lib. iii. on the Sentences, dist. xiii. (quoted by *Dorner*, pp. 124, 125). *Thomas Aquinas* P. iii. Qu. 8, 1, etc., quoted by *Dorner*, p. 126, ss. Comp. *Cramer*, vii. p. 571, ss.: *Baur*, ii. 787. [*Baur*, Dogmengesch. 259, says, that the christological theory of Aquinas ran out dialectically into the two negative positions, that God became nothing to the incarnation, and that of man as a real subject of the incarnation nothing could be said, because the subject (person) of the union is only the Son of God. The humanity of Christ is only a human nature, and not a human personality; the union kept the nature from becoming a person—otherwise the personality of the human nature must have been destroyed by the union. On the christological views of *Anselm* and *Abelard*, especially in relation to the possibility of Christ's sinning, see *Neander*, Hist. Dogmas, 513, *sq.* *Anselm* says, "that Christ could have sinned if he had so willed, but this possibility is only hypothetical;" Cur Deus Homo, ii. 10. *Abelard*, on Romans, avers, "that if Christ be regarded as a mere man, it is doubtful whether we could say of him *nullo modo peccare posse*; but speaking of him as God and man, only a *non posse peccare* is to be admitted."]

[6] Concerning the mystical mode of interpretation adopted by *John Damascenus* and others, especially by his supposed disciple, *Theodore Abukara*, see *Dorner*, p. 115, ss. On the connection between the scholastic

* John of Cornwall appeals among other things to the usage of language. When we say, *e. g.*, All men have sinned—Christ is expressly excepted. Or, again, we say, Christ was the most holy of men; or, we count the twelve apostles and their Master together, and say, there are thirteen persons. All this could not be, if Christ were not—*aliquis homo*. See, further, in *Baur*, ubi supra.

definitions and the mystical, comp. ibid.—*John Scotus Erigena* considers the historical Christ as one in whom the human race is ideally represented; and at the same time he always strives to preserve Christ's specific dignity. Thus in De Divis. Nat. ii. 13: Humano intellectui, quem Christus assumsit, omnes intellectuales essentiæ inseparabiliter adhærent. Nonne plane vides, omnem creaturam, intelligibiles dico sensibilesque mediasque naturas, in Christo adunatam. Comp. v. 25, p. 252: Quanquam enim totam humanam naturam, quam totam accepit, totam in se ipso et in toto humano genere totam salvavit, quosdam quidem in pristinum naturæ statum restituens, quosdam vero per excellentiam ultra naturam deificans; in nullo tamen nisi in ipso solo humanitas deitati in unitatem substantiæ adunata est, et in ipsam deitatem mutata omnia transcendit. Hoc enim proprium caput Ecclesiæ sibi ipsi reservavit, ut non solum ejus humanitas particeps deitatis, verum etiam ipsa deitas, postquam ascendit ad Patrem, fieret; in quam altitudinem nullus præter ipsum ascendit nec ascensurus est. [Comp. *Christlieb's* John Scotus Erigena, 1860, pp. 330–360. Erigena on the *exinanitio* espoused the view held afterwards by the Calvinists in distinction from the Lutherans, p. 335. He makes the incarnation to be necessary, v. 25: Si Dei sapientia in effectus causarum, quæ in ea æternaliter vivunt, *non descenderet*, *causarum ratio periret*: pereuntibus enim causarum effectibus nulla causa remaneret, etc. Notwithstanding Erigena's strong assertion about the historical Christ, the drift of his doctrine is to give to the incarnation a merely ideal, or symbolical character. He anticipates Schelling and Hegel in a striking manner; see *Christlieb*, p. 354, *sq.*]—The scholastics in general recognized something universal in Christ, as the prototype of the race, without, however, impairing his historical individuality; see *Dorner*, p. 141.—This was still more the case with the mystics. Some of them, *e. g.*, *Gerock*, prebendary of *Reichersberg*, protested as early as the time of the rise of Scholasticism, against the refining and hair-splitting tendency which became prevalent in regard to christology (especially in opposition to Folmar); see *Cramer*, l. c. p. 43–78. The disciples of the school of St. Victor looked with an indifferent eye upon the subtler development of this dogma (*Dorner*, p. 142, note.) All the mystics urged that Christ is quickened *in* us. Thus *Ruysbrock* said, "Christ had his divinity and humanity by nature; but we have it when we are united to him in love by grace;" Comp. *Engelhardt's* Monograph, p. 157, and the entire section, p. 177–179. *Tauler*, Predigten, vol. i. p. 55, expressed himself as follows:—"We hold that we are susceptible of blessedness in the same manner in which *he* is susceptible, and that we receive here on earth a foretaste of that eternal blessedness which we shall enjoy hereafter. Since even the meanest powers and bodily senses of our Lord Jesus Christ were so united with his divine nature, that we may say, *God* saw, *God* heard, *God* suffered, so we, too, enjoy the advantage, in consequence of our union with him, that all *our* works may become divine. Further, human nature being united with the divine person, and with the angels, all men have more followship with him than other creatures, inasmuch as they are the members of his body, and are influenced by him as by their head, etc..... Not many sons! You may and ought to differ [from each other] according to your natural birth, but in the eternal birth there can be only *one* Son,

since in God there exists only *one* natural origin, on which account there can be only *one* natural emanation of the Son, not two. *Therefore, if you would be one son with Christ, you must be an eternal outflowing together with the eternal word.* As truly as God has become man, so truly man has become God by grace; and thus human nature is changed into what it has become, viz., into the divine image, which is consequently an image of the Father," etc. Compare also the sermon on Christmas-day, vol. i. p. 89, and other passages.—*Deutsche Theologie*, ch. 22: "Where God and man are so united, that we may say in truth, and truth itself must confess, that there is one who is verily perfect God, and verily perfect man, and where man is nevertheless so devoted to God, that God is there man himself, and that he acts and suffers entirely without any self-hood, or for self, or for self-having [Germ. ohne alles Ich, Mir und Mein], (*i. e.*, without any self-will, self-love and selfishness): behold, *there is verily Christ, and no where else.*" Comp. ch. 24 and ch. 43: "*Where the life of Christ is, there is Christ himself*, and where his life is not, there he is not."*—The language of *Wessel* is simple and dignified; De Causa Incarnat. c. 7, p. 427 (quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 267): "Every noble soul hath something divine in itself, which it loves to communicate. The more excellent it is, the more it endeavors to imitate the Divine Being. Accordingly, that holy and divinely beloved soul (*i. e.* Christ), resembling God more than any other creature, gave itself wholly up for the brethren, as it saw God doing the same with regard to itself." Comp. cap. 16, p. 450, and De Magnit. Passionis c. 82, p. 627: Qui non ab hoc exemplari trahitur, non est. On the human development of the Redeemer, see ibid. c. 17, p. 486, quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 259.

[7] Thus the Beghards: Dicunt, se credere, quod quilibet homo perfectus sit Christus per naturam. (*Mosheim*, p. 256, after the letter of the bishop of Strasbourg.) According to *Baur* (Gesch. d. Trinit. ii. 310, comp. however, note to above), the church doctrine as expounded by John Scotus Erigena, was nothing more than that of the immanence of God in the world, which appeared in man in the form of an actual, concrete self-consciousness. [Comp. also *Christlieb*, ubi supra.]

The *partus virgineus* was one of those subjects which greatly occupied the ingenuity of the scholastics. It was at the foundation of the controversy between *Paschasius Radbert* and *Ratramn*, about the year 850, on the question, whether Mary had given birth to Christ *utero clauso?* to which the former (after Jerome) replied in the affirmative, the latter (as Helvidius had done) in the negative. For further details, see *Münscher*, ed. by von Colln, pp. 85 and 86; and *Walch*, C. G. F. Historia Controversiæ sæculi IX. de Partu B. Virginis. Gott. 1758. 4°. *Anselm* sought to prove in a very ingenious way, that the birth of the Virgin was necessary in the circle of divine possibilities, Cur Deus Homo, ii. 8: Quatuor modis potest Deus facere hominem; videlicet aut de viro et de femina, sicut assiduus usus monstrat; aut nec de viro nec de femina, sicut creavit Adam; aut de viro sine femina, sicut fecit Evam; aut de femina sine viro, quod nondum fecit. Ut igitur hunc quoque modum probet sum subjacere potestati, et ad hoc ipsum opus dilatum esse, nihil convenientius, quam ut de femina sine viro assumat illum hominem, quem quærimus. Utrum autem de virgine aut de non virgine dignius hoc fiat, non est opus disputare, sed sine omni dubitatione asserendum est, quia de virgine hominem nasci oportet.—In the

* Lest this passage might be misinterpreted, so as to refer to a mere ideal Christ, comp. what is said c. 52: "All that is hitherto written, Christ taught by a long life, which lasted thirty-three years and six months," etc.

writings of *Robert Pulleyn*, we meet with absurd questions respecting the exact moment *at* which, and the manner *in* which, the union of the divine nature of the Son with the human assumed in the womb of Mary, had taken place (*Cramer*, vi. p. 484, ss.)

The fondness of the scholastics for starting all sorts of questions, led them also to inquire, whether the union between the divine and human natures of Christ continued to exist after his death (the separation of the body from the soul.) *Pulleyn* replied in the affirmative. He supposed that only Christ's body had died, but not the whole man Christ; see *Cramer*, vi. pp. 487, 488. A controversy was also carried on between the Franciscans and Dominicans respecting the question, whether the blood shed on the cross was also separated from the divine nature of Christ? A violent discussion took place in Rome at Christmas, 1462. The Dominicans took the affirmative, the Franciscans the negative side of the question. At last Pope Pius II. prohibited the progress of the controversy by a bull, issued A. D. 1464; see *Gobellin*, Comment. Pii II. Rom. 1584, p. 511..... Fleury, Hist. ecclesiast. xxiii. p. 167, ss.

§ 180.

REDEMPTION AND ATONEMENT.

* *Baur*, Geschichte der Versönungslehre, p. 118, ss. *Seisen*, Nicolaus Methonensis, Anselmus Cantuariensis, Hugo Grotius, quod ad Satisfactionis Doctrinam a singulis excogitatum inter se comparati. Heidelberg, 1838–40. [*Thomasius*, Christologie, iii. 1. Comp. § 134. *Anselm's* Cur Deus Homo, transl. by Vose, in Bib. Sacra, 1854–5.]

The mythical notion, developed in the preceding period, of a legal transaction with the devil, and the deception practised upon him on the part of God and Christ, was also adopted by some theologians of the present period, *e. g.*, *John Damascenus*.[1] But it soon gave way, or at least became subordinate to, another theological mode of stating the doctrine, viz., that the fact of redemption was deducible with logical necessity from certain divine and human relations. We find the transition to this in the Greek church in the writings of *Nicolas of Methone*,[2] who arrived at similar conclusions with Anselm, though independently of him. In the Western church, *Anselm of Canterbury* established his theory with an amount of ingenuity, and a completeness of reasoning, hitherto unattained. It is in substance as follows: In order to restore the honor of which God was deprived by sin, it was necessary that God should become man; that, by voluntary submission to the penalty of death, he might thus, as God-man, cancel the debt, which, beside him, no other being, whether a heavenly one or an earthly one, could have paid. And he not only satisfied the requirements of divine justice, but, by so doing, of his own free will, he did more than was needed, and was rewarded by obtaining the deliverance of man from the penalty pronounced upon him. Thus the apparent contradiction between divine love on the one hand, and divine justice and benevolence on the other, was adjusted.

[1] De Fide Orth. iii. 1.: Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ δημιουργός τε καὶ κύριος τὴν ὑπὲρ

τοῦ οἰκείου πλάσματος ἀναδέχεται πάλην, καὶ ἔργῳ διδάσκαλος γίνεται. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ θεότητος ἐλπίδι ὁ ἐχθρὸς δελεάζει τὸν ἄνθρωπον, σαρκὸς προβλήματι δελεάζεται καὶ δείκνυται ἅμα τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ σοφὸν, τὸ δίκαιον τε καὶ τὸ δυνατὸν τοῦ θεοῦ· τὸ μὲν ἀγαθὸν, ὅτι οὐ παρεῖδε τοῦ οἰκείου πλάσματος τὴν ἀσθένειαν, ἀλλ' ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτῷ πεσόντι, καὶ χεῖρα ὤρεξε· τὸ δὲ δίκαιον, ὅτι ἀνθρώπου ἡττηθέντος οὐχ ἕτερον ποιεῖ νικῆσαι τὸν τύραννον, οὐδὲ βίᾳ ἐξαρπάζει τοῦ θανάτου τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλ' ὃν πάλαι διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας καταδουλοῦται ὁ θάνατος, τοῦτον ὁ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος νικητὴν πάλιν πεποίηκε, καὶ τῷ ὁμοίῳ τὸν ὅμοιον ἀνεσώσατο, ὅπερ ἄπορον ἦν· τὸ δὲ σοφὸν, ὅτι εὗρε τοῦ ἀπόρου λύσιν εὐπρεπεστάτην. He opposed, indeed, the notion (of Gregory of Nyssa), that the devil had received the ransom, iii. 27 : Μὴ γὰρ γένοιτο τῷ τυράννῳ τὸ τοῦ δεσπότου προσενεχθῆναι αἷμα, but used very strange language in the subsequent part of the chapter : Πρόσεισι τοιγαροῦν ὁ θάνατος καὶ καταπιὼν τὸ σώματος δέλεαρ τῷ τῆς θεότητος ἀγκίστρῳ περιπείρεται, καὶ ἀναμαρτήτου καὶ ζωοποίου γευσάμενος σώματος διαφθείρεται καὶ πάντας ἀνάγει, οὓς πάλαι κατέπιεν

[2] Anecd. i. p. 25, ms. fol. 148 b., (quoted by Seisen, p. i.); ibid., p. 30, ss. fol. 150 b., (quoted by Seisen, p. 2) : Ἦν γὰρ θανάτῳ ὑπεύθυνον τὸ πᾶν ἡμῶν γένος· πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον, κέντρον δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ἐστὶν ἡ ἁμαρτία (1 Cor. xv. 56), δι' ἧς τρώσας ἡμᾶς ὁ θάνατος καταβέβληκε, καὶ ἄλλως οὐκ ἦν τῶν δεσμῶν τῆς δουλείας ἀπαλλαγῆναι τοὺς δόρατι ληφθέντας, ἢ διὰ θανάτου (Rom. v. 14.) Τὰ γὰρ λύτρα ἐν τῇ αἱρέσει κεῖται τῶν κατεχόντων. Οὐκ ἦν οὖν ὁ δυνάμενος ὑπελθεῖν τὸ δρᾶμα καὶ ἐξαγορᾶσαι τὸ γένος, οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς τῶν τοῦ γένους ἐλεύθερος· μόγις δὲ τῆς ἰδίας ἐνοχῆς ἐλευθεροῦταί τις, ὅς ἑαυτοῦ ἀποθνήσκων οὐ δυνάμενος συνελευθερῶσαι ἕνα γοῦν ἑαυτῷ. Εἰ δὲ οὐδένα, τίς ἦν δυνατὸς, ὅλον κοσμον ἀπαλλάξαι δουλείας ; εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἀξιόχρεως ἦν πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν ἐλευθερίαν ἕκαστος· ἀλλ' οὖν οὐκ ἦν πρέπον, πάντας ἀποθανεῖν, οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὴν τοῦ θανάτου ἐξουσίαν καταμεῖναι. Τίνος οὖν ἦν τὸ κατόρθωμα ; δῆλον ὅτι ἀναμαρτήτου τινός. Τίς δὲ τῶν πάντων ἀναμάρτητος ἢ μόνος ὁ Θεός ; ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν καὶ Θεοῦ τὸ ἔργον ἦν καὶ χωρὶς θανάτου καὶ τῶν ἡγησαμένων τοῦ θανάτου παθῶν ἀδύνατον ἦν τελεσθῆναι, ὁ Θεὸς δὲ παθῶν καὶ θανάτου ἐστὶν ἀπαράδεκτος, προσέλαβε φύσιν παθῶν καὶ θανάτου δεκτικὴν, ὁμοουσίαν ἡμῖν ὑπάρχουσαν κατὰ πάντα καὶ ἀπαραλλάκτως ἔχουσαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὁμου λαβὴν διδοὺς τῷ προσπαλαίοντι θανάτῳ κατὰ σάρκα, καὶ δι' αὐτῆς τῆς ὑποκειμένης αὐτῷ φύσεως καταγωνιούμενος αὐτὸν, ἵνα μήτε αὐτὸς χώραν σχοίη λέγειν, οὐχ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ Θεοῦ ἡττῆσθαι, μήτε μὴν ἡμεῖς καταμαλακιζοίμεθα πρὸς τοὺς ἀγῶνας· καιροῦ καλοῦντος ἔχοντες παράδειγμα τὴν ὁμοφυῆ καὶ ὁμοούσιον σάρκα, ἐν ᾗ κατεκρίθη ἡ ἁμαρτία, χώραν οὐδόλως εὑροῦσα ἐν αὐτῇ..... Οὐ γὰρ μάτην τι γέγονε τῶν περὶ τὸ τίμιον αὐτοῦ παθος συμβεβηκότων, ἀλλὰ λόγῳ τινὶ κρείττονι καὶ ἀναγκαίῳ, πᾶσαν λόγων δύναμιν ὑπερβάλλοντι. Comp. Refut. p. 155, ss., quoted by *Seisen*, p. 4, and *Ullmann*, p. 90, ss. "*He agreed* (with Anselm) *principally in endeavoring to demonstrate that the Redeemer must needs have been God and Man, but differed from him in this, that Anselm referred the necessity of the death of Jesus to the divine holiness, while Nicolas brought it into connection with the dominion of Satan over sinful men.*" Ullmann, p. 94.

[3] "*The relation in which Anselm's theory of satisfaction stands to the opinions which had generally obtained previous to his time, is chiefly expressed in his decided opposition to the principle on which those views were founded, in relation to the devil;*"* *Baur*, Versöhnungslehre, p. 155. Cur Deus Homo i. 7. and ii. 19: Diabolo nec Deus aliquid debebat nisi pœnam, nec homo, nisi vicem, ut ab illo victus illum revinceret; sed quidquid ab illo exigebatur, hoc Deo debebat, non diabolo. Comp. Dial. de Verit. c. 8 (in *Hasse*, ii. 86): Dominus Jesus, quia solus innocens erat, non *debuit* mortem pati, quia ipse sapienter et benigne et utiliter *voluit* eam sufferre. The theory of Anselm is rather established upon the idea of *sin* (comp. § 176, note 4.) It is the duty of man to honor God; by sin he has deprived him of the honor due to him, and is obliged to make retribution for it in a striking manner. So in i. 11: Hunc honorem debitum qui Deo non reddit, aufert Deo quod suum est, et Deum exhonorat, et hoc est peccare. Quamdiu autem non solvit, quod rapuit, manet in culpa; nec sufficit solummodo reddere, quod ablatum est, *sed pro contumelia illata plus debet reddere, quam abstulit.* Com. also c. 13: Necesse est ergo, ut aut ablatus honor solvatur, aut pœna sequatur, alioquin aut sibi ipsi Deus justus non erit, aut ad utrumque impotens erit, quod nefas est vel cogitare. It may be true that God can not, properly speaking (*i. e.*, objectively), be deprived of his honor, but he must insist upon its demands, for the sake of his creatures; the order and harmony of the universe require it. i. c. 14: Deum impossibile est honorem suum perdere....Cap. 15: Dei honori nequit aliquid, quantum ad illum pertinet, addi vel minui. Idem namque ipse sibi honor est incorruptibilis et nullo modo mutabilis. Verum quando unaquæque creatura suum et quasi sibi præceptum ordinem sive naturaliter sive rationabiliter servat, Deo obedire et cum dicitur honorare; et hoc maxime rationalis natura, cui datum est intelligere quid debeat. Quæ cum vult quod debet, Deum honorat; non quia illi aliquid confert, sed quia sponte se ejus voluntati et dispositioni subdit, et in rerum universitate ordinem suum et ejusdem universitatis pulchritudinem, quantum in ipsa est, servat. Cum vero non vult quod debet, Deum, quantum ad illam pertinet, inhonorat, quoniam non subdit se sponte illius dispositioni, et universitatis ordinem et pulchritudinem, quantum in se est, perturbat, licet potestatem aut dignitatem Dei nullatenus lædat aut decoloret. (With this the idea is connected, that the deficiency in the hierarchia cœlestis, occasioned by the fall of the angels, was made up by the creation of man.

* It is worthy of notice that, as the doctrines of the Church were gradually developed in the lapse of ages, the kingdom of Satan was more and more put into the background, as the shadows disappear before the light. During the first period, up to the complete overthrow of Manicheism, the demons occupied an important place in the doctrines respecting God and the government of the world, as well as in anthropology, until Augustine (in the second period) showed that the origin of sin is to be found in a profounder view of human nature. And lastly, in the course of the present period, the connection between the doctrines of Christology and Soteriology on the one hand, and the doctrine of demoniacal agency on the other, being dissolved, the latter is pushed back to eschatology, where the devil finds his proper place in hell. Still further, the relation of the devil to the work of redemption was still so prominent even in the time of Anselm, that Abelard was accused of heresy for contesting the *right* of the devil to man; see Bernhard. Epist. cxc. 5, in Mabillon, Tom. i. p. 650 sq. (Comp. *Hasse's* Anselm, ii. 493).

c. 16. (Comp. above § 172, Note 5.) From the reasons referred to, it would be unworthy of God to pardon the sinner, merely by making use of his supreme authority, in the way of mercy; (i. c. 6), and c. 12: Non decet Deum peccatum sic inpunitum dimittere..... In that case, injustice would be more privileged than justice. (Liberior est injustitia, si sola misericordia dimittitur, quam justitia.) Comp. c. 19. But man can not make satisfaction, inasmuch as he is corrupt by original sin (i. c. 23: quia peccator peccatorem justificare nequit): nevertheless it was necessary that satisfaction should be given by *a human being*, i. c. 3: Oportebat namque ut sicut per hominis inobedientiam mors in humanum genus intraverat, ita per hominis obedientiam vita restitueretur, et quemadmodum peccatum, quod fuit causa nostræ damnationis, initium habuit a femina, sic nostræ justitiæ et salutis auctor nasceretur de femina, et ut diabolus, qui per gustum ligni, quem persuasit, hominem vicerat, ita per passionem ligni, quam intulit, ab homine vinceretur. But could not God have created a sinless man? Be it so; but then the redeemed would have come under the dominion of him who had redeemed them, *i. e.*, under the dominion of a man, who would himself be nothing but a servant of God, to whom angels would not render obedience, (i. c. 5.) And besides, man himself owes obedience to God, i. c. 20: In obedientia vero quid das Deo, quod non debes, cui jubenti totum, quod es et quod habes et quod potes, debes?..... Si me ipsum et quidquid possum, etiam quando non peeco, illi debeo, ne peccem, nihil habeo, quod pro peccato illi reddam.—Nor could any higher being (*e. g.* an angel) take upon him the work of redemption, for so much is sure: Illum, qui de suo poterit Deo dare aliquid, quod superet omne quod sub Deo est, majorem esse necesse est, quam omne quod non est Deus..... Nihil autem est supra omne quod Deus non est, nisi Deus..... Non ergo potest hanc satisfactionem facere nisi Deus, (ii. c. 6.) If therefore none can make satisfaction but God himself, and if it be nevertheless necessary that a man should make it, nothing remains but that—the *Godman* should undertake it; ibid.: Si ergo, sicut constat, necesse est, ut de hominibus perficiatur illa superna civitas, nec hoc esse valet nisi fiat præ licta satisfactio, quam nec potest facere nisi Deus, nec debet nisi homo: necesse est, ut eam faciat *Deus homo*. It is, moreover, necessary that the Godman should be of the race of Adam, and born of a virgin (c. 8. comp. § 179); and among the three persons of the Trinity, it appears most seemly that the Son should assume humanity (ii. c. 9. comp. § 170, Note 6). In order to make satisfaction for man, he had to give something to God which he did not owe to him, but which, at the same time, was of more value than all that is under God. Concerning obedience, he owed it to God, like every other rational creature; but he was not obliged to die (c. 10, 11.) Nevertheless, he was willing to lay down his life of his own accord, ibid.: Video, hominem illum plane, quem quærimus, talem esse oportere, qui nec ex necessitate moriatur, quoniam erit omnipotens, nec ex debito, quia nunquam peccator erit; et mori possit ex libera voluntate quia necessarium erit; for death is the greatest sacrifice which man can offer, ibid.: Nihil asperius, aut difficilius potest homo ad honorem Dei sponte et non ex debito pati, quam mortem; et nullatenus se ipsum potest homo magis

dare Deo, quam cum se morti tradit ad honorem illius.* But it was because it was voluntary, that the act had an infinite value; for his death outweighs all sins, however numerous or great, c. 14. A: Cogita etiam, quia peccata tantum sunt odibilia, quantum sunt mala, et vita ista tantum amabilis est, quantum est bona. Unde sequitur, quia vita ista plus est amabilis, quam sint peccata odibilia. B. Non possum hoc non intelligere. A. Putasne tantum bonum tam amabile posse sufficere ad solvendum, quod debetur pro peccatis totius mundi? B. Imo plus potest in infinitum. (On this account Christ's atonement has also a reacting influence upon our first parents, c. 16, and upon Mary herself, ibid. and c. 17, comp. § 178, note 2.) But the offering, thus voluntarily made, could not but be recompensed. As the Son, however, already possessed what the Father possesses, the reward due to him must accrue to the advantage of others, viz. men (ii. 19.) Thus the love and the justice of God may be reconciled with each other, c. 20: Misericordiam vero Dei, quæ tibi perire videbatur, cum justitiam Dei et peccatum hominis considerabamus, tam magnam tamque concordem justitiæ invenimus, ut nec major nec justior cogitari possit. Nempe quid misericordius intelligi valet, quam cum peccatori tormentis æternis damnato, et unde se redimat non habenti, Deus pater dicit: Accipe Unigenitum meum, et da pro te; et ipse Filius: Tolle me, et redime te?..... Quid etiam justius, quam ut ille, cui datur pretium majus omni debito, si debito datur affectu, dimittat omne debitum? And lastly, we should not pass by his caution at the close of his treatise (c. 22.): Si quid diximus, quod corrigendum sit, non renuo correctionem, si rationabiliter sit. Si autem testimonio veritatis roboratur, quod nos rationabiliter invenisse existimamus, Deo, non nobis attribuere debemus, qui est benedictus in sæcula. Amen. [On Anselm's view compare *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 514 sq., viz. he affirms the necessity of an active (rather than passive) vicarious sacrifice.]

Notwithstanding all its appearance of logical consequence, the theory of Anselm, as has been remarked, is open to the charge of an internal contradiction. For though Anselm himself admitted, that God could not be deprived of his honor objectively, he nevertheless founded his argument upon this objective fact, and made it necessary that, after all, the love and compassion of God should come in, accept the satisfaction *voluntarily* made by *another* and an innocent being, and *for his sake* remit the punishment due to actual transgressors, who, on their part could not retrieve their loss. Comp. *Baur*, p. 168–179. *Schweizer*, too, in his Glaubensl. d. reformirten Kirche, ii. 391, says, that the theory of Anselm hovers between the fœdus operum and the fœdus gratiæ. To this it has been replied, that Anselm clearly distinguishes between the *immanent* and the *transeunt* (declarative) honor of God, and that his argument starts with this; see *Hasse's* Anselm, ii. 576.—But, further, the subjective (moral) aspect is put too much into the background by the objective (legal) one; and the rest of the redeeming work of Christ, as seen in his life, almost vanishes out of sight (comp. however, ii. c. 18.) Nor can it be denied, that the reconciliation spoken of is rather one made on the part of God with men, than a reconciliation of men with God; see *Baur*, p. 181. *Ullmann* (Nicolas of Methone, p. 93.) We should, however, be careful not to confound the theory of Anselm with its development by later Protestant theologians. On the question, whether the satisfaction

* Comp. also i. cap. 9: Non coëgit Deus Christum mori, in quo nullum fuit peccatum, sed ipse sponte sustinuit mortem, non per obedientiam deserendi vitam, sed propter obedientiam servandi justitiam, in qua tam fortiter perseveravit, ut inde mortem incurreret.

referred to by Anselm is, properly speaking, *not so much a suffering of punishment, as merely an active rendering of obedience?* inasmuch as he makes a difference between punishment and satisfaction (i. 15. necesse est, ut omne peccatum satisfactio *aut* pœna sequatur:) see Baur, p. 183 ss. Nevertheless, it is certain, that the satisfaction made by Christ, in the view of Anselm, consisted, if not exclusively, at least principally, in submitting to sufferings and death; it can not, therefore, be said with Baur, "*that the idea of a punishment, by which satisfaction is made, and which is suffered in the room of another, does not occur in the scheme of Anselm.*" [*Baur*, Dogmengesch. 160–61, finds the nerve of Anselm's theory in Cur Deus Homo, i. 23: Nullatenus debet aut potest accipere homo a Deo, quod Deus illi dare proposuit, si non reddit Deo totum, quod illi abstulit, ut sicut per illum Deus perdidit, ita per illum Deus recuperet.—The honor of God is to be restored, not merely negatively by punishment, but positively by satisfaction: the satisfaction, as such, is a moral act and desert.] On the other hand, it must be admitted that Anselm rests contented with the idea of the suffering of death: in his writings nothing is said of the Redeemer being under the burden of the *Divine wrath*, of his taking upon him the torments of hell, or what is called the anguish of the soul, etc. The chaste and noble, tragical style, too, in which the subject is discussed, forms a striking contrast with the weak and whining, even sensuous "theology of blood" of later ages.—Respecting the relation in which Anselm's theory stood to the doctrine of earlier times, see *Baur*, p. 186 ss. *Neander*, Church Hist. (Torrey's transl.), iv. 500–7. [On Anselm's theory, see British and Foreign Quarterly Review, Edinb. 1859. The best and fullest account is in *Hasse's* Anselm. Comp. also *Thomasius*, Christi Person und Werk, iii. 217–228: "We can not say, that here the love of God is sacrificed to his justice, nor that the love of the Father recedes behind the love of the Son, nor that the relation between guilt and satisfaction is viewed merely quantitatively; but yet it is true, that the love of God is not made sufficiently prominent, and that the passive obedience of Christ does not come to its full recognition, since the death of Christ is not viewed as the suffering of a divine judgment, but as a gift to the honor of God, hence it is not strictly vicarious, but rather supplementary." Yet "the idea of satisfaction has been made by Anselm the inalienable possession of the church."—*Neander*, Hist. Dogmas, p. 521: "From the time of Anselm, two opposing views of redemption were developed: the one viewed its method as objectively necessary, and derived its efficiency from this necessity; the other assigned rather a subjective connexion to the two, as if it had been merely the pleasure of God to connect the price of redemption with the sufferings of Christ, because these were best adapted to effect the moral transformation of man." Comp., also, *Ritschl*, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1860, p. 584, sq.]

§ 181.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION AND ATONEMENT.

The contemporaries and immediate successors of Anselm were far from adopting his theory in all its strictness.[1] On the contrary, *Abelard*, taking in this case, as well as in many others, the opposite side of the question, attached principal importance to the moral aspect of the doctrine, and declared the love of Christ the redeeming principle, inasmuch as it calls forth love on our part.[2] *Bernard of Clairval*, on the other hand, insisted upon the mystical idea of the vicarious death of Christ.[3] *Hugo of St. Victor* adhered more nearly to the doctrine of Anselm, but modified it so far as to return to the earlier notion of a legal transaction and struggle with the

devil ; at the same time he asserted (with Abelard) the moral significance of Christ's death.[4] The opinions of *Robert Pulleyn* and *Peter Lombard* were still more closely allied with those of Abelard, though the latter combined with it other aspects of the atonement.[5] The later scholastics returned to the doctrine of Anselm, and developed it more fully.[6] Thus *Thomas Aquinas* brought the priestly office of Christ prominently forward, and laid great stress upon the superabounding merit of his death.[7] *Duns Scotus* went to the other extreme, denying its sufficiency ;[8] but he supposed a voluntary acceptance on the part of God. *Wycliffe* and *Wessel* attached importance to the theory of satifaction in its practical bearing upon evangelical piety, and thus introduced the period of the Reformation.[9] The mystics either renounced all claims to doctrinal precision, and, abandoning themselves to the impulses of feeling and imagination, endeavored to sink into the depth of the love dying on the cross ; or they thought to find the true principle of redemption in the repetition in themselves of the sacrifice once made by Christ, *i. e.*, in literally crucifying their own flesh.[10] Those of a pantheistic tendency annulled all that was peculiar in the merits of Christ.[11] The external and mythical interpretation of the doctrine, as a legal transaction, led to offensive poetical exaggerations and distortions of the truth.[12]

[1] "*If we must, on the one hand, acknowledge that Anselm's theory of satisfaction is a brilliant specimen of the dialectical and speculative acuteness of the scholastics, it must appear to us strange on the other hand, that he stands alone, and does not seem to have convinced any of his successors of the necessity of the standpoint which he assumed :*" *Baur*, Versöhnungslehre, p. 189.

[2] *Abelard* opposed, like *Anselm*, but still more decidedly, the introduction of the devil into the plan of redemption: Comment. in Epist. ad Rom. Lib. ii. (Opp. p. 550), quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 163 ; *Baur*, p. 191. The real ground of the reconciliation was stated by him as follows (p. 553, quoted by *Baur*, p. 194) : Nobis autem videtur, quod in hoc justificati sumus in sanguine Christi et Deo reconciliati, quod per hanc singularem gratiam nobis exhibitam, quod filius suus nostram susceperit naturam, et in ipso nos tam verbo, quam exemplo instituendo usque ad mortem perstitit, nos sibi amplius per amorem astrixit, ut tanto divinæ gratæ accensi beneficio, nil jam tolerare propter ipsum vera reformidet caritas. . . . . Redemtio itaque nostra est illa summa in nobis per passionem Christi dilectio, quæ nos (*leg.* non) solum a servitute peccati liberat, sed veram nobis filiorum Dei libertatem, acquirit, ut amore ejus potius quam timore cuncta impleamus, qui nobis tantam exhibuit gratiam, qua major inveniri, ipso attestante, non potest. "*Thus the two representatives of scholasticism, in its first period, when it developed itself in all its youthful vigor, Anselm and Abelard, were directly opposed to each other, with respect to the doctrines of redemption and atonement. The one considered the last ground of it to be the divine justice, requiring an infinite equivalent for the*

infinite guilt of sin, that is, a necessity founded in the nature of God; the other held it to be the free grace of God, which, by kindling love in the breast of man, blots out sin and with sin its guilt." *Baur*, Versöhnungslehre, p. 195. On the endeavors of Abelard, notwithstanding his other views, to represent redemption in its legal aspect, see ibidem. [Abælardi Opera, 1606, p. 590: Sed et hoc, ni fallor, contuendo nobis Apostolus reliquit (Rom. v. 12, *sq.*), Deum in incarnatione filii sui id quoque sibi machinatum fuisse, ut non solum misericordia, verum et justitia per eum subveniret peccantibus, *et ipsius justitia suppleretur, quod delictis nostris præpedibatur*.....Homo itaque factus lege ipsa dilectionis proximi constringitur, ut eos, qui sub lege erant, nec per legem poterant salvari, redimeret, et quod in nostris non erat meritis, ex suis suppleret, et sicut sanctitate singularis extitit, singularis fieret utilitate in aliorum etiam salute.]

[3] *Bernard* opposed Abelard, in the first place, in respect to the point that the devil has no legal claims upon man, see Epist. 190, de Erroribus Abælardi ad Innocentem III., quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 164, *Baur*, Versöhnungsl. p. 202. He made a distinction between jus acquisitum, and jus nequiter usurpatum, juste tamen permissum. He ascribed the latter to the devil: Sic itaque homo juste captivus tenebatur: ut tamen nec in homine, nec in diabolo illa esset justitia, sed in Deo. Bernard, moreover, urged especially the fact, that Christ as the head, had made a satisfaction for the members. [Homo siquidem, qui debuit, homo qui salvit. *Nam si unus*, inquit (2 Cor. v. 16) *pro omnibus mortuus est, ergo omnes mortui sunt*, ut videlicet satisfactio unius hominis imputetur, sicut omnium peccata unus ille portavit, nec alter jam inveniatur, qui forefecit (*i. e.* peccavit), alter, qui satisfecit, quia caput et corpus unus est Christus.]—Satisfecit caput pro membris, Christus pro viscer.bus suis (see *Baur*, pp. 202, 203.) Bernard's views were most nearly allied to those of Augustine and Gregory the Great.

[5] In the system of *Hugo*, God appeared as the *patronus* of man, and the opponent of the devil. But, first of all, it was necessary to conciliate his favor. This idea is largely dwelt upon in his Dialogus de Sacramentis legis naturalis et scriptæ. De Sacram. c. 4: Dedit Deus gratis homini, quod homo ex debito Deo redderet. Dedit igitur homini hominem, quem homo pro homine redderet, qui, ut digna recompensatio fieret, priori non solum æqualis, sed major esset. Ut ergo pro homine redderetur homo major homine, factus est Deus homo pro homine—Christus ergo nascendo debitum hominis patri solvit et moriendo reatum hominis expiavit, ut, cum ipse pro homine mortem, quam non debebat, sustineret, juste homo propter ipsam mortem, quam debebat, evaderet, et jam locum calumniandi diabolus non inveniret, quia et ipse homini dominari non debuit, et homo liberari dignus fuit.—The following is written rather in the spirit of Abelard, c. 10: .....Ut in Deo humanitas glorificata exemplum esset glorificationis hominibus; ut in eo, qui, passus est, videant, quid ei retribuere debeant, in eo autem, qui glorificatus est, considerent, quid ab eo debeant exspectare; ut et ipse sit via in exemplo et veritas in promisso et vita in præmio. Comp. *Liebner*, Hugo von St. Victor, p. 417, ss. *Baur*, Versöhnungsl. 206, 208.

[6] Concerning *Pulleyn*, who in other respects was praised by Bernard on

account of his orthodoxy, see *Cramer*, vol. vi. p. 490, ss, *Baur*, p. 205. [*Pulleyn* says, the Redeemer must suffer, in part because this was necessary to our redemption (though we might have been redeemed in some other way), in part, as an example to us in the endurance of suffering. But the price of redemption was paid, not to the devil, which is impossible; but to God.] *Peter Lombard*, more than any of the other scholastics, regarded the subject in question from the psychologico-moral point of view (see *Baur*, p. 299), Sent. Lib. iii. Dist. 19: A. Quomodo a peccatis per ejus mortem soluti sumus? Quia per ejus mortem, ut ait Apostolus, commendatur nobis caritas Dei, *i. e.*, apparet eximia et commendabilis caritas Dei erga nos in hoc, quod filium suum tradidit in mortem pro nobis peccatoribus. Exhibita autem tantæ erga nos dilectionis arrha et nos movemur accendimurque ad diligendum Deum, qui pro nobis tanta fecit, et per hoc *justificamur*, *i. e.*, soluti a peccatis justi *efficimur*. Mors ergo Christi nos justificat, dum per eam caritas excitatur in cordibus nostris.—Peter Lombard decidedly opposed the notion, that God had, as it were, altered his views respecting the sinner, in consequence of the death of Christ, ibid., F: Reconciliati sumus Deo, ut ait apostolus, per mortem Christi. Quod non sic intelligendum est, quasi nos ei sic reconciliaverat Christus, ut inciperet amare quos oderat, sicut reconciliatur inimicus inimico, ut deinde sint amici, qui ante se oderant, sed jam nos diligenti Deo reconciliati sumus. Non enim, ex quo ei reconciliati sumus per sanguinem filii, nos cœpit diligere, sed ante mundum priusquam nos aliquid essemus.—Nevertheless he also admitted the doctrine of substitution, though he expressed himself respecting it in very general terms (as did Bernard of Clairval); loc. cit. D. [*Thomasius* Christi Person, iii. 232, quotes from the Lombard: Peccata nostra, *i. e.*, pœnam peccatorum nostrorum in corpore suo super lignum portasse, quia per ipsius pœnam, quam in cruce tulit, omnis pœna temporalis, quæ pro peccato conversis debetur, in baptismo penitus relaxatur, ut nulla a baptizato exigatur et in pœnitentia minoratur. Non enim sufficeret illa pœna, qua pœnitentes ligat ecclesia, nisi pœna coöperaretur, qui pro nobis solvit.] (*Baur*, p. 213.) And lastly the devil occupied a very strange position in the system of Peter Lombard. (Quid fecit redemptor captivatori nostro? tetendit ei muscipulum crucem suam: posuit ibi quasi escam sanguinem suum.) *Baur*, p. 211, comp. also p. 79. [On the views of Raymund Lulli, see *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 581. Of *Innocent* III., *Neander* says (p. 583), that he was "the first who represented the satisfaction of Christ as a reconciliation between the divine attributes of mercy and justice:" Modum invenit, per quem utrique satisfaceret tam misericordiæ quam justitiæ: judicavit igitur, ut assumeret in se pœnam pro omnibus et donaret per se gloriam universis. Sermo i. fol. 6, ed. Colon. 1575. "This," adds Neander, "was the first assertion of the *satisfactio vicaria passiva* among the schoolmen." *Neander* also cites from *William of Paris*: Quid mirum est, Deum esse factum hominem, participatione humanæ naturæ, ut homo etiam fieret Deus, congruenti sibi participatione deitatis. The love of God must be revealed, that man may love God: Quia amor amore convenientius accenditur, sicut ignis igne, decuit Deum amorem nostrum amore suo accendere.]

• Thus *Alanus ab Insulis* iii. (quoted by *Pez*, T. i. p. 493–97); *Albertus*

Magnus (Sent. Lib. iii. Dist. 20, Art. 7); *Alexander Hales*, in Summæ P. iii. Qu. 1, Membr. 4, ss., see *Cramer*, vii. p. 574, ss., *Baur*, p. 215, note. [*Alexander*, Summa, Pars iii. qu. 1. membrum 5, that man can not make satisfaction without the gift of grace: Membr. 6, that no creature could do it, being finite: Membr. 7, that only the Godman could do it: Ergo necesse est, quod satisficiat Deus, qui potest, et homo, qui debet, ergo debet satisfacere Deus homo, et non solus Deus nec solus homo.] *Bonaventura* (Opp. T. v. p. 191, ss., ibid. p. 218, ss.)

[7] Summæ Pars, iii. Qu. 22, (de Sacerdotio Christi), quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by Von Cölln, p. 166. His theory of satisfaction will be found ibid. Qu. 46–49.* *Baur*, Versöhnungsl. p. 230, ss. He discussed especially the necessity of suffering, and the question, Whether God could have redeemed man in any other way? and replied to it both in the affirmative and negative, according to the idea formed of necessity. (Art. 2. *Baur*, p. 232.) At all events, the sufferings of Christ were the most proper way, and the one most to the purpose. It was also significant, that Christ suffered on the *cross*, which reminds us not only of the tree in Paradise, but also of this, that the cross is a symbol of various virtues, as well as of that breadth, and length, and depth, and height of which the apostle spoke (Eph. iii. 18), of our exaltation into heaven, etc. While Anselm did not go beyond the simple fact of Christ's death, Aquinas endeavored to demonstrate, that Christ endured in his head, hands, and feet, *all the sufferings* which men have to endure in their reputation, worldly possessions, body and soul, in head, hands, and feet; accordingly, *the pain of the sufferings of Christ is by far the greatest* which can be endured in the present life (in proof of which he adduced several arguments.) Nevertheless *his soul possessed the uninterrupted enjoyment of blessedness*, Art. 8, (but Thomas Aquinas himself did not as yet speak of the soul's enduring the torments of hell, or bearing the eternal curse, thus leaving the sufferings incomplete.) [But *Aquinas* considers this case of eternal punishment, also; and argues, that Christ need not, and could not, thus suffer; the dignity of his person, and his voluntary sacrifice were sufficient; see *Thomasius*, ubi supra, 236 sq. Christ suffered all that man deserved, "secundum genus," and not "secundum speciem."] He further propounded (like Bernard of Clairval) the mystical idea, according to which the head suffers for the members (Quæst. 48, art. 1.): Christus per suam passionem non solum sibi, sed etiam omnibus membris suis meruit salutem. Passio non est meritoria, inquantum habet principium ab exteriori, sed secundum quod eam aliquis voluntarie sustinet, sic habet principium ab interiori, et hoc modo est meritoria.—Thomas made use of the same mys-

* In *Thomas Aquinas* we also find (as the title indicates) the first hints about the *threefold office* of Christ, since he views him as legislator, sacerdos and rex. However, he does not use the expression *munus*, *officium*, and only develops the *sacerdotium*, showing how Christ was at once *sacerdos* and *hostia perfecta*. See *Gieseler*, Dogmengesch. 513. [*Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl. I. 3, already recognizes the three offices, saying, that high priests, kings and prophets were anointed as types, having reference to the true Christ, the Logos, who is the only high priest of all, the only king of all creation, and the only arch-prophet of the prophets of the Father. Comp. *Ebrard* in Herzog's Real-encyclop.]

tical idea to refute the objection that one being could not make satisfaction for another; for, inasmuch as two are made one through love, the one may make satisfaction for the other. Concerning the meritum superabundans, Qu. 48, art. 2: Christus autem ex charitate et obedientia patiendo majus aliquid Deo exhibuit, quam exigeret recompensatio totius offensæ humani generis: primo quidem propter magnitudinem *charitatis*, ex qua patiebatur; secundo propter *dignitatem vitæ* suæ, quam pro satisfactione ponebat, quæ erat vita Dei et hominis; tertio propter *generalitatem passionis et magnitudinem doloris* assumti.....et *ideo passio Christi non solum sufficiens, sed etiam superabundans satisfactio fuit pro peccatis humani generis* (1 John ii. 2.) Respecting his further statements, see *Baur*, Versöhnungslehre, and Münscher, edit. by Von Cölln, p. 167. [*Thomasius*, ubi supra, 236 sq., and *Ritschl*, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1860, p. 597 sq.]

[8] *Duns Scotus* in Sent. L. iii. Dist. 19: . . . Quantum vero attinet ad meriti sufficientiam, fuit profecto illud finitum, quia causa ejus finita fuit, videlicet voluntas naturæ assumptæ, et summa gloria illi collata. Non enim Christus quatenus Deus meruit, sed in quantum homo. Proinde si exquiras, quantum valuerit Christi meritum secundum sufficientiam, valuit procul dubio quantum fuit a Deo acceptatum. Siquidem divina acceptatio est potissima causa et ratio omnis meriti.....Tantum valuit Christi meritum sufficienter, quantum potuit et voluit ipsum Trinitas acceptare, etc.—Thus he destroyed the principal argument of Anselm's theory in his Cur Deus Homo? for, since Christ suffered only in his human nature, an angel, or any other man, might have suffered quite as well, as Duns Scotus was fully prepared to admit. Comp. *Baur*, p. 256. On this account the sufferings of Christ appeared even less necessary to Scotus than they did to Thomas Aquinas. Both their systems are compared by *Baur*, Versöhnungsl. pp. 257, 258.—*Bonaventura* occupied an intermediate position between the two former, by teaching a *perfectio et plenitudo* meriti Christi. Brev. iv. c. 7, Cent. iii. sect. 30. [The theory of Scotus was favored by nominalism. Clement VI sanctioned the Thomist theory in his jubilee bull of 1343. *Baur*. *William Occam*, the great reviver of nominalism, passes over the topic wholly in his commentary on the Lombard, and merely alludes to it in his *Quodlibeta*. The Spanish nominalist, *Michael de Plaçois* (in the 16th century), says: Mortem Christi non explevisse justitiam, sed solum explevisse ex magna condignitate—quod ad justitiæ æqualitatem attinet, tantum valorem habere oportuisse opera puri hominis, quantum habuerunt opera Christi, quia per se neutra sufficiebant. Quoted in *Thomasius*, ubi supra, p. 245. On *Gabriel Biel*, see ibid. p. 251 sq. On Duns Scotus, see Ritschl, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol. 1860, p. 565 sq.]

[9] *Wycliffe*. Trialogus iii. c. 25 (De Incarnatione et Morte Christi), quoted by *Baur*, p. 273. [Dialog. lib. iii. cap. 25: Salvari enim oportet illum hominem (Adam), cum tam fructuose pœnituit, et Deus non potest negare suam misericordiam taliter pœnitenti. Et cum, juxta suppositionem tertiam, oportet, quod satisfactio pro peccato fiat, ideo oportet, quod idem illud genus hominis tantum satisfaciat, quantum in prothoplasto deliquerat, quod nullus homo facere poterat, nisi simul fuerat Deus et homo.....Et fuit necessa-

rium, ipsam acceptum fuisse in ligno, ut sicut ex fructu ligni vetito periit homo, sic ex fructu ligni passo salvetur homo. Et sunt aliæ multæ congruentiæ utrobique.] He laid, however, quite as much stress upon repentance as upon the theory of satisfaction.—According to *Wessel*, Christ was our Redeemer, even *by representing in himself the divine life* (an idea which had almost wholly sunk into oblivion since the time of Anselm.) Nevertheless he was also Mediator; yea, he was God, priest, and sacrifice at the same time. We see in him both the God who was reconciled, and the one who brought about that reconciliation. Comp. De Magnitud. Passionis, c. 17, and Exempla Scalæ Meditationis, Ex. iii. p. 391; quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 261, *Baur*, p. 277. "*Wessel, too, considered the sufferings of our Lord as being made by a substitute; but going beyond the merely external and legal transaction, he asserted the necessity of a living faith, and the appropriation of the Spirit of Christ:*" *Ullmann*, p. 264. He attached, therefore (as did Abelard and Peter Lombard), great importance to the principle of love. He who would form a correct estimate of the full measure of the sufferings of Christ, must come to them, above all, with an eye exercised in love; De Magnit. Passionis, p. 19. Further passages may be seen in the works of *Ullmann* and *Baur*.

[10] The emotional contemplation of the sufferings of Christ, and expressions such as "*the blood of Jesus, full of love, and red like a rose*" (*e. g.* in the writings of *Suso*), may, indeed, be traced to mysticism. But the true mystics did not rest satisfied with this. Thus the author of the "Deutsche Theologie," c. 3, after having proved that God had assumed humanity in order to remove the effects of the fall, thus continues: "Though God were to take to himself all men who exist, and to assume their nature, and be incarnated in them, and make them divine in him, yet, if the same did not take place with regard to *myself*, my fall and rebellion would never be destroyed."—In more distinct reference to the design of the *sufferings* of Christ, *Tauler* said (in a sermon on Luke x. 23, quoted by *Wackernagel*, Lesebuch i. sp. 868): "Since your great God was thus set at nought, and condemned by his creatures, and was crucified and died, you should, with patient endurance, and with all suffering humility, *behold yourselves in his sufferings, and have your minds thereby impressed.*" Compare also his Sermons, i. p. 289 (Sermon on Good Friday.)—Bishop Master *Albrecht* said: "Four-and-twenty hours compose day and night; take one of the hours and divide it into two, and spend it in contemplating the sufferings of our Lord—that which is better and more useful to man than if all men, and all the saints, and all the angels of God, and Mary, the mother of God, should remember him [*i. e.*, should intercede for him.] As man dies a bodily death, so he dies unto all sin, by *serious meditation on the sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ.*" (Sprüche deutscher Mystiker, in *Wackernagel's* Lesebuch, sp. 889.)—But not only did the mystics urge the necessity of recalling the sufferings of Christ by inward contemplation, but the same idea was also externally represented by the self-inflicted torments of ascetics, especially of the Flagellantes of the middle ages. In the latter case it must, however, be admitted, that as the spirit of self-righteousness was called forth, the merits of Christ were thrown into the shade. Thus, it is said, in one of the hymns

of the Flagellantes (A. D. 1349): "Through God *we* shed our blood, on account of which our sins will be pardoned." (Hoffmann, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, p. 94.)

[11] The Beghards taught: Christus non est passus pro nobis, sed pro se ipso. (Mosheim, p. 256.) *Almarich of Bena* maintained, that by all Christians being members of Christ, we are to understand, that, as such, they participated in the sufferings of Christ on the cross. (*Engelhardt*, p. 253.) Thus he inverted the doctrine according to which the head died for the members (that of Bernard of Clairval, and Thomas Aquinas.)

[12] *Jacob de Theramo*, who lived in the fourteenth century (1382) treated the transaction between Christ and Belial (the devil) in the form of a judicial process; this was translated into German in the 15th century, under the title: "Hie hept sich an ein Rechtsbuoch;" comp. *W. Wackernagel*, Die altdeutschen Handschriften der Baseler Universitätsbibliothek, 1835, 4to. pp. 62, *sq. Baur*, (relying on Döderlein's Diss. Inauguralis, 1774–5, in his Opusc. Academ. Jena, 1789), calls it a carnival play; but it is not so, the subject is intended to be treated in an earnest spirit. Compare a similar drama: Extractio Animarum ab Inferno, *in the English Miracle-Plays or Mysteries, by W. Marriott.* Bas. 1838, p. 161. [Comp. *Karl Hase*, das geistliche Schauspiel, 1858.]

§ 182.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN SOTERIOLOGY AND CHRISTOLOGY.

Julius Müller in the Deutsche Zeitschrift f. christl. Wissenschaft. Oct. 1850.

In the theory of Anselm, so much importance was attached to the incarnation and death of Jesus, as the foundation of the work of redemption, that there was danger lest the wonderful life of the Redeemer, which lies between the two, should lose its religious significance. There were, however, those who again directed attention to the life of the Godman, as itself having a redeeming power.[1] Some, indeed, made it appear that Christ came into the world only in order to die, and that consequently he would not have been sent at all if there had been no sin to atone. On the other hand, others, *e. g. Wessel*, pointed out in various ways the significance which the manifestation of God in the flesh must have, independently of sin and its effects, as the keystone of creation, and crown of humanity.[2]

[1] See *Wessel* in the preceding §, note 9.

[2] Comp. vol. i. § 64. "*The question, whether Christ would have assumed the nature of man if there had been no sin, was not discussed until the middle ages, being started, as it appears, for the first time by Rupertus, Abbot of*

Duitz, in the 12th century." *Dorner*, p. 134; comp. his work, De Glorificatione Trinitatis, et Processione Sp. Sanct. lib. iii. c. 21; iv. 2, and Comm. in Matth. de Gloria et Honore Filii homin. lib. xiii. (Opera, Tom. ii. 164); *Gieseler*, Dogmengesch. 514. [Rupert says, that men and angels were created for the sake of the one man, Jesus Christ; he, the head and king of all elect angels and men, did not need sin in order to become incarnate. *Alexander of Hales* adopted the same view: Summa Theol. P. iii. Qu. 2, Membr. 13. *Bonaventura* agrees with Aquinas.]—The language of *Thomas Aquinas* sufficiently shows that he too felt disposed to look upon the incarnation of Christ as being in one respect the completion of creation. In his Comment. on the Sentences, Lib. iii. Dist. 1. Qu. 1, Art. 3, he said, that the incarnation had not only effected deliverance from sin, but also—humanæ naturæ exaltationem et totius universi consummationem. Comp. Summa, P. iii. Qu. 1, Art. 3; Ad omnipotentiam divinæ virtutis pertinet, ut opera sua perficiat et se manifestet per aliquem infinitum effectum, cum sit finita per suam essentiam. Nevertheless, he thought it more probable (according to P. iii. Qu. 1, 3), that Christ would not have become man if there had been no sin. This notion generally obtained, and theologians preferred praising (after the example of Augustine) sin itself as felix culpa (thus *Richard of St. Victor*, De Incarnat. Verbi. c. 8), rather than admit the possibility of the manifestation of the Son of God apart from any connection with sin. *Duns Scotus*, however, felt inclined to adopt the latter view, which was more in accordance with his entire Pelagian tendency;* Lib. iii. Sent. Dist. vii. Qu. 3, and Dist. xix. On the other hand, *Wessel*, whose sentiments were by no means like those of Pelagius, took the same view (De Incarn. c. 7 and c. 11, quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 254). In his opinion the final cause of the incarnation of the Son of God is not to be found in the human race, but in the Son of God himself. He became man for his own sake; it was not the entrance of sin into the world which called forth this determination of the divine will; Christ would have assumed humanity even if Adam had never sinned: Si incarnatio facta est principaliter propter peccati expiationem, sequeretur, quod anima Christi facta sit non principali intentione, sed quadam quasi occasione. Sed inconveniens est, nobilissimam creaturam occasionaliter esse introductam (quoted by *Dorner*, p. 140.)

[Comp. on the subject of this section, *W. Flörke*, in Zeitschrift f. d.

* This was done in later times by the Socinians. Nevertheless, the theory in question may be so strained, "*that sin is made light of, and mankind exalted, rather than the dignity of Christ augmented.*" (Dorner, p. 137.) But whether the notion of a felix culpa, by which sin is made to appear as *θεοτόκος*, might not lead men so far as to worship it on pantheistic grounds, and at the same time to make light of it in the moral point of view, is another question. And, on the other hand, if we, looking at sin in a *serious* light, regard the incarnation of Christ *merely* as something which has become necessary in order to repair the damage, its happy aspect will be lost sight of, and the joy we might experience at Christmas will too soon be changed into the weeping and wailing of the Passion-week. This is the principal defect of Anselm's theory. But with respect to the exaltation of mankind at the expense of the dignity of Christ, the latter, so far from being endangered by the theory of Wessel, is raised by the idea that Christ assumed humanity not on account of man, but *for his own sake*, an idea by which the pride of man is humbled. [This note is omitted in the 5th edition of Hagenbach.]

Lutherische Theologie, 1854, p. 209–249; *Liebner*, in his Christologie; *Dorner*, Lehre von der Person Christi; *Thomasius*, Christi Person und Werk, i. 169. *Aquinas* denied the position, that Christ would have become incarnate even if there had been no sin, not merely on the ground that the Scripture connects the incarnation only with sin, but also, because the perfection of the universe did not require it: Ad perfectionem universi sufficit, quod naturali modo creatura ordinetur in Deum sicut finem. Hoc autem excedit limites perfectionis naturæ, ut creatura uniatur Deo in persona: *Summa*, Pars iii. qu. 1, art. 3. *Raymund Lulli*, as quoted in *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 582, says that the incarnation is indeed a work of free love; and that we can not say that it was only brought about by sin, but that God owed it to himself: Alias Deus non solveret debitum sibi ipsi et suis dignitatibus.]

FIFTH DIVISION.

THE ORDO SALUTIS.

§ 183.

PREDESTINATION.

(*The Controversy of Gottschalk.*)

Cellot, L., Historia Gotteschalci. Par. 1655, f. †*Staudenmaier*, Scotus Erigena, p. 170, ss. *Gfrörer*, on Pseudo-Isidore in the Tübingen Theol. Zeitschrift, xviii. 274, *sq.* *Wiggers*, Schicksale d. Augustinischen Anthropologie, in *Niedner's* Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol., 1857–8. [*Weizsäcker*, Das Dogma von der göttlichen Vorherbestimmung im neunten Jahr. in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol., 1859. Archb. *Ussher*, Gottschalcus et Prædest. Controvers. ab eo mota, Dublin, 1631, and in *Ussher's* Works, 16 vols., Dublin, 1837–40. The Predestination Controversy in the Ninth Century, Princeton Review, 1840. *F. Monnier*, De Gottschalci et Joan. Scoti Erigenæ Controversia, Paris, 1853.]

Great as was the authority of Augustine in the West, the prevailing notions concerning the doctrine of Predestination contained more or less of the Semipelagian element.[1] Accordingly, when in the course of the ninth century *Gottschalk*, a monk in the Franciscan monastery of Orbais, ventured to revive the rigid Augustinian doctrine, and even went so far as to assert a twofold predestination, not only to salvation but also to damnation,[2] he exposed himself to persecution. He was in the first instance, opposed by *Rabanus Maurus*,[3] and afterwards condemned by the Synods of Mayence (A. D. 848), and of Quiercy (Cressy, Carisiacum, A. D. 849).[4] *Hincmar*, Archbishop of Rheims, took part in the transactions of the latter Synod. Though *Prudentius of Troyes*,[5] *Ratramn*,[6] *Servatus Lupus*,[7] and several others, pronounced in favor of Gottschalk, though under certain modifications, *John Scotus Erigena*, by an ingenious argumentation contrived to preserve the appearance of Augustinian orthodoxy, by maintaining, on the basis of the position borrowed from Augustine, that evil was something negative, and therefore could not, as such, be predestinated by God.[8] The objections advanced by *Prudentius* and *Florus* (Magister) were as little heeded as the steps taken by *Remigius*, Archbishop of Lyons, in behalf of Gottschalk.[9] On the contrary, the second Synod of Quiercy (Cressy, A. D. 853) laid down four articles, in accordance with the views of

Hincmar ;[10] then several bishops at the Synod of Valence drew up six other articles of a contrary tendency, which were confirmed by the Synod of Langres (A. D. 859),[11] but zealously opposed again by Hincmar.[12] Gottschalk, the victim of the passions of others, bore his fate with that fortitude and resignation, which have at all times characterised those individuals or bodies of men who have adopted the doctrine of Predestination.

[1] The theologians of *the Greek church* retained the earlier definitions as a matter of course. John Damasc. De Fide Orthod. ii. c. 30 : Χρὴ γινώσκειν, ὡς πάντα μὲν προγινώσκει ὁ θεὸς, οὐ πάντα δὲ προορίζει· προγινώσκει γὰρ τὰ ἐφ' ἡμῖν, οὐ προορίζει δὲ αὐτά. (Comp. § 177, note 1).—Respecting the opinions entertained by the theologians of the Western church ; see vol. i. § 114. The venerable *Bede* (Expositio Allegorica in Canticum Cantic.) and *Alcuin* (de Trinit. c. 8) adopted, in the main, the views of Augustine, but rejected the prædestinatio duplex. Comp. *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, pp. 121, 122. They were, however, unconscious of the difference between themselves and Augustine; see Neander, Church History, iv. p. 472, *sq.* *Wiggers*, ubi supra.

[2] Respecting the history of his life, and the possible connection between it and his doctrine, see Neander, l. c. p. 414, ss. ; Staudenmaier, l. c. p. 175, [and Gieseler, ii. § 16.] His own views, as well as those of his opponents, may be gathered from *Guilb. Maugin*, Vett. Auctorum, qui sæc. IX. de Prædestinatione et Gratia scripserunt, Opera et Fragmenta. Paris, 1650, Tomi. ii. 4to (in T. ii. : Gotteschalcanæ Controversiæ Historica et Chronica Dissertatio.) In the Libellus Fidei which Gottschalk presented to the synod of Mayence, he asserted : Sicut electos omnes (Deus) prædestinavit ad vitam per gratuitum solius gratiæ suæ beneficium.....sic omnino et reprobos quosque ad æternæ mortis prædestinavit supplicium, per justissimum videlicet justitiæ suæ judicium (after Hincmar, de Præd. c. 5). In his confession of faith (given by *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 122) he expressed himself as follows : Credo et confiteor, quod gemina est prædestinatio, sive electorum ad requiem, sive reproborum ad mortem. But he referred the prædestinatio duplex not so much to *evil* itself, as to the *wicked*. Compare the passage quoted by *Neander*, iii. 475 : Credo atque confiteor, præscisse te ante sæcula quæcunque erunt futura sive bona sive mala, prædestinasse vero tantummodo bona. On the connection subsisting between his views and those of Augustine, see *Neander*, l. c. p. 474. [The fundamental idea of Gottschalk was that of the divine immutability.....He does not speak of a predestination to evil, but to death. See *Baur*, Dogmengesch. 215. Comp. *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 448, *sq.*]

[3] Epist. synodalis Rabani ad Hincmar. given in *Mansi* T. xiv. p. 914, and *Staudenmaier*, p. 179 : Notum sit dilectioni vestræ, quod quidem gyrovagus monachus, nomine Gothescalc, qui se asserit sacerdotem in nostra parochia ordinatum, de Italia venit ad nos Moguntiam, novas superstitiones et noxiam doctrinam de prædestinatione Dei introducens et populos in errorem mittens; dicens, quod prædestinatio Dei, sicut in bono, sic ita et in malo, et tales sint in hoc mundo quidam, qui propter prædestinationem Dei, quæ eos cogat in

mortem ire, non possint ab errore et peccato se corrigere, quasi Deus eos fecisset ab initio incorrigibiles esse, et pœnæ obnoxios in interitum ire.—As regards the doctrine of Rabanus Maurus himself, he made the decree of God respecting the wicked depend on his prescience, see *Neander*, l. c. p. 476.

[4] Mansi T. xiv.—On the outrageous treatment of Gottschalk, see *Neander*, l. c. p. 478.

[5] *Prudentii Trecassini* (of Troyes) Epistola ad Hincmarum Rhemig. et Pardulum Laudunensem (which was written about the year 849, and first printed in *Lud. Cellotii* Historia Gotteschalci. Par. 1655). He asserted a twofold predestination, but made the predestination of the wicked (reprobation) depend on the prescience of God. He further maintained that Christ had died for none but the elect (Matt. xx. 28), and interpreted 1 Tim. ii. 4, as meaning: vel omnes ex omni genere hominum [comp. Augustine Enchirid. c. 103], vel omnes velle fieri salvos, quia nos facit velle fieri omnes homines salves. Compare *Neander*, l. c. p. 481–89.

[6] At the request of the Emperor, Charles the Bald, he composed the work, De Prædestinatione Dei libri ii. in which he expressed himself as follows (quoted by *Mauguin* T. i. p. 94, *Staudenmaier*, p. 192): Verum quemadmodum æterna fuit illorum scelerum scientia, ita et definita in secretis cœlestibus pœnæ sententia; et sicut præscientia veritatis non eos impulit ad nequitiam, ita nec prædestinatio coëgit ad pœnam. Comp. *Neander*, l. c. p. 482.

[7] *Servatus Lupus* was abbot of Ferrières. Respecting his character, and the history of his life, see *Sigebert Gemblac*, de Scriptt. Eccles. c. 94. *Staudenmaier*, p. 188. He excelled as a classical scholar, and wrote about the year 850: De Tribus Questionibus (1. de libero arbitrio; 2. de prædestinatione bonorum et malorum; 3. de sanguinis Domini taxatione). See *Mauguin* T. i. P. ii. p. 9, ss.—*He* too interpreted those passages which are favorable to the doctrine of universal redemption, in accordance with the scheme of particularism (*Neander*, l. c. p. 482, ss.); but his milder principles induced him to leave many points undecided, as he was far from claiming infallibility (*Neander*, p. 484.)

[8] Probably about the year 851 he addressed a treatise entitled: Liber de divina Prædestinatione to Hincmar and Pardulus; see *Mauguin*, T. i. P. i. p. 103, ss. He too did this at the request of the Emperor Charles the Bald. —The idea of a *prædestinatio* properly speaking can not be applied to God, since with him there is neither a *future* nor a *past*. As moreover sin ever carries its own punishment with itself (de Præd. c. 6: Nullum peccatum est, quod non se ipsum puniat, occulte tamen in hac vita, aperte vero in altera), there is no need of a predestinated punishment. Evil itself does not exist at all for God; accordingly the prescience, as well as the predestination, of evil, on the part of God, is altogether out of question. Comp. *Neander*, p. 485. It is, however, to be noted, that Erigena only denies that the predestination is *twofold*, and the idea that this is *divine*. In harmony with his whole speculative tendency, he could not give up the view, that, as God is the ground of all things, so, too, from eternity all is embraced in his purpose: hence he says in De Prædest. 18, 7: Prædestinavit Deus impios ad pœnam vel ad

interitum; and in 18, 8, he even speaks of a definite number of the good and evil. Evil itself seems to him to be adopted into God's plan of the world (supralapsarian?); see *Ritter*, Gesch. d. Phil. vii. 270, *sq.* Comp. Erigena's doctrine about sin and the fall, in § 176, note 4, above; and De Divis. Nat. v. 36, p. 283. [Compare also the passages quoted by Jacobi in Neander's Hist. Dogm. 452; and the long and thorough exposition in *Christlieb's* John Scotus Erigena, pp. 361–390. The points in his theory are that God himself is predestination; since God is essentially free will, there is in his pre-predestination no necessity; as God is one, so is his predestination one. (Prædestinatio essentialiter de Deo prædicari non est dubium. Essentia autem unitas. Prædestinatio igitur unitas. Unitas dupla non est. *Prædestinatio igitur dupla non est, ac per hoc nec gemina:* De Divis. Nat. iii. § 5.) He denies the prescience of God in respect to evil, because evil is *nihil*, it is nowhere substantially present. Grace is universal. *Christlieb*, ubi supra, gives an instructive comparison of his views with those of Origen, Spinoza and Schleiermacher.]

[9] *Prudentii* Ep. Trecassini De Prædestin. contra Joann. Scotum liber, given by *Mauguin* T. i. Pars. i. p. 197, ss.—*Flori Magistri* et ecclesiæ Lugdunensis Liber adversus Jo. Scoti erroneas Definitiones; ibid. T. i. P. i. p. 585. *Neander*, p. 489. On *Remigius* of Lyons compare Neander, l. c. p. 491. Staudenmaier, p. 194, ss.

[10] Synodi Carisiacæ Capitula 4. (given by *Mauguin* T. i. P. ii. p. 173, *Münscher*, edit. by *Von Cölln*, p. 125.) Cap. i.; Deus omnipotens hominem sine peccato rectum cum libero arbitrio condidit et in Paradiso posuit, quem in sanctitate justitiæ permanere voluit. Homo libero arbitrio male utens peccavit et cecidit, et factus est massa perditionis totius humani generis. Deus autem bonus et justus elegit ex eadem massa perditionis secundum *præscientiam* suam, quos per gratiam *prædestinavit ad vitam*, et vitam illis prædestinavit æternam. Cæteros autem, quos justitiæ judicio in massa perditionis reliquit, *perituros præscivit, sed non ut perirent prædestinavit; pœnam* autem illis, quia justus est, *prædestinavit æternam.* Ac per hoc *unam Dei prædestinationem tantummodo dicimus*, quæ ad donum pertinet gratiæ aut ad retributionem justitiæ. Cap. ii. Libertatem arbitrii in primo homine perdidimus, quam per Christum Dominum nostrum recepimus. *Et habemus liberum arbitrium ad bonum*, præventum et adjutum gratia, et habemus *liberum arbitrium ad malum*, desertum gratia. Liberum autem habemus arbitrium, quia gratis liberatum, et gratia de corrupto sanatum. Cap. iii. *Deus omnipotens omnes homines sine exceptione vult salvos fieri*, licet non omnes salventur. Quod autem quidam salvantur, salvantis est donum: quod autem quidam pereunt, pereuntium est meritum. Cap. iv. Christus Jesus Dominus noster, sicut nullus homo est, fuit vel erit, cujus natura in illo assumta non fuerit: ita nullus est, fuit vel erit homo, pro quo passus non fuerit; licet non omnes passionis ejus mysterio redimantur. Quod vero omnes passionis ejus mysterio non redimuntur, non respicit ad magnitudinem et pretii copiositatem, sed ad infidelium et ad non credentium ea fide, quæ per dilectionem operatur, respicit partem: quia poculum humanæ salutis, quod confectum est infirmitate nostra et virtute divina, habet quidem in se ut omnibus prosit, sed si non bibitur, non medetur.

[11] Concilii Valentini III. Can. i.–vi. given by *Mauguin*, l. c. p. 231, ss. Can. iii.; Fidenter fatemur prædestinationem electorum ad vitam et *prædestinationem impiorum ad mortem:* in electione tamen salvandorum misericordiam Dei præcedere meritum bonum, in damnatione autem perituroruin meritum malum præcedere justum Dei judicium. Prædestinatione autem Deum ea tantum statuisse, quæ ipse vel gratuita misericordia, vel justo judicio facturus erat.....in malis vero ipsorum malitiam præscisse, quia ex ipsis est, non prædestinasse, quia ex illo non est. Pœnam sane malum meritum eorum sequentem, uti Deum, qui omnia prospicit, præscivisse et prædestinasse, quia justus est..... *Verum aliquos ad malum prædestinatos esse divina potestate, videlicet ut quasi aliud esse non possint, non solum non credimus*, sed etiam si sunt qui tantum mali credere velint, cum omni detestatione sicut Arausica synodus (vol. i. § 114), illis Anathema dicimus.—According to Can. iv., Christ shed his blood only for believers.—The general import of the canons was expressed in the following terms: Quatuor capitula, quæ a Concilio fratrum nostrorum minus prospecte suscepta sunt, propter inutilitatem vel etiam noxietatem et errorem contrarium veritati.....a pio auditu fidelium penitus explodimus et ut talia et similia caveantur per omnia auctoritate Spiritus S. interdicimus.—The doctrines of Scotus Erigena were condemned as ineptæ quæstiunculæ et aniles pæne fabulæ (see Neander, l. c. p. 493.) The six Canones Lingonenses (given by *Mauguin*, l. c. p. 235, ss.) were merely a repetition of the former four. Attempts at union were made at the Synod of Savonières (apud Saponarias), a suburb of Toul, but it was found impossible to come to an understanding. See *Neander*, p. 493.

[12] He composed (A. D. 859) a defence of the Capitula, which was addressed to the Emperor Charles the Bald, under the title: De Prædestinatione et libero Arbitrio contra Gothescalcum et cæteros Prædestinatianos (in Hincmari Opp. ed. *Sismondi* T. i. p. 1–410.)

§ 184.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION.

[*J. B. Mozley*, Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination, Lond., 1855. Chapters ix., x. pp. 250–314 on the Scholastic Theories. *Hampden's* Bampton Lectures, 3d. ed., 1848; Lect. iv. pp. 153–207. *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 448, *sq.*]

Among the scholastics, *Anselm*,[1] *Peter Lombard*,[2] and *Thomas Aquinas*,[3] in particular, endeavored to retain Augustine's doctrine of an unconditional election, though with many limitations. The entire religious tendency of *Bonaventura* also kept him from restricting the grace of God, even when he maintained, for practical interests, that the ground of his mercy was to be found in the measure of man's susceptibility to that which is good.[4] But this idea was also taken up by some, who knew how to make use of it in favor of a trivial theory of the meritoriousness of works, and Augustinianism

was thus perverted into a new Semipelagianism by *Scotus* and his followers.[5] Accordingly, *Thomas of Bradwardine* (a second Gottschalk, living in the fourteenth century) found it necessary to commence a new contest in defence of Augustine and his system.[6] The forerunners of the Reformation, *Wycliffe*, *Savonarola*, and *Wessel*, were also led by a living conviction of man's dependence on God, to return to the more profound fundamental principles of Augustinianism, though the last of these three urged the necessity of a free appropriation of divine grace on the part of man, as a conditio sine qua non.[7]

[1] Anselm composed a separate treatise on this subject, entitled: De Concordia Præscientiæ et Prædestinationis nec non Gratiæ Dei c. libero Arbitrio. in Opp. p. 123–34. (150–164.) He proceeded on the assumption that no difference exists between prescience and predestination. P. ii. c. 10: Dubitari non debet, quia ejus prædestinatio et præscientia non discordant, sed sicut præscit, ita quoque prædestinat; he referred, however, the one as well as the other, in the first instance, to that which is good, c. 9: Bona specialius præscire et prædestinare dicitur, quia in illis facit, quod sunt et quod bona sunt, in malis autem non nisi quod sunt essentialiter, non quod mala sunt. Comp. P. 1. c. 7. But *he* too differed in some points from Augustine. Thus he called the proposition: non esse liberum arbitrium nisi ad mala, absurd (ii. c. 8), and endeavored to hold the doctrine of the freedom of the will together with that of predestination. But the freedom of the will, in his opinion, does not consist in a mere liberty of choice, for in that case the virtuous would be less free than the vicious. On the contrary, the rational creatures received it—ad servandam acceptam a Deo rectitudinem. Anselm also showed that Scripture is favorable to both systems (that of grace, and that of the freedom of the will), and then continued as follows: Quoniam ergo in sacra Scriptura quædam invenimus, quæ soli gratiæ favere *videntur*, et quædam, quæ solum liberum arbitrium statuere sine gratia putantur: fuerunt quidam superbi, qui totam virtutem et efficaciam in sola libertate arbitrii consistere sunt arbitrati, et sunt nostro tempore multi [?], qui liberum arbitrium esse aliquid penitus desperant.—Therefore, cap. 14: Nemo servat rectitudinem acceptam nisi volendo, velle autem illam aliquis nequit nisi habendo. Habere vero illam nullatenus valet nisi per gratiam. Sicut ergo illam nullus accipit nisi gratia præveniente, ita nullus eam servat nisi eadem gratia subsequente. Compare also his treatise De libero Arbitrio, and *Möhler*, Kleine Schriften, i. p. 170, ss. [Comp. *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 507: In Anselm the freedom of contingency appears as a necessary transition stage of development: Hoc propositum, secundum quod vocati sunt sancti, in æternitate in qua non est præteritum vel futurum, sed tantum præsens, immutabile est, sed in ipsis hominibus ex libertate arbitrii aliquando est mutabile.]

[2] Sent. Lib. i. Dist. 40. A: Prædestinatio est gratiæ præparatio, quæ sine præscientia esse non potest. *Potest autem sine prædestinatione esse præscientia.* Prædestinatione quippe Deus ea præscivit, quæ fuerat ipse facturus, sed præscivit Deus etiam quæ non esset ipse facturus, *i. e.*, omnia mala.

Prædestinavit eos quos elegit, reliquos vero reprobavit, *i. e.*, ad mortem æternam præscivit peccaturos. On the election of individuals, see dist. 46, ss., and compare 47.

[3] Summæ P. i., Qu. 23, Art. 1, ss., (quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by *Von Cölln*, p. 151–154.) He there distinguished between electio and dilectio.—God will that all men should be saved antecedenter, but not consequenter (*θέλημα προηγούμενον* and *ἑπόμενον*.)—Respecting the causa meritoria, see Art. 5. [*Aquinas* makes *Prædestinatio*, to be—pars providentiæ respectu eorum qui divinitus ordinantur in æternam salutem; and *Reprobatio*, pars providentiæ respectu illorum qui ab hoc fine decidunt (Art. 2). In Art. 4: *Dilectio præsupponitur electioni* secundum rationem, et *electio prædestinationi*. Unde omnes prædestinati sunt electi et dilecti.—On the question whether prevision of merit is the cause of predestination (Art. 5), he distinguishes between the effect of predestination, *in particulari*, and *in communi;* and of the latter says—impossibile est quod totus prædestinationis effectus in communi habeat aliquam causam ex parte nostra: quia quidquid est in homine ordinans ipsum in salutem, comprehenditur totum sub effectu prædestinationis, etiam *ipsa præparatio ad gratiam.*]

[4] Comment. in Sent. Lib. i. Dist. 40, Art. 2, Qu. 1, (quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by *Von Cölln*, p. 154).—The free will, as a causa contingens, is included in the prescience. [*Bonaventura* raises the question, An prædestinatio inferat salutis necessitatem? and replies—quod prædestinatio non infert necessitatem saluti, nec infert necessitatem libero arbitrio. Quoniam *prædestinatio non est causa salutis, nisi includendo merita*, et ita salvando liberum arbitrium. *Münscher*, ubi supra.]

[5] *Duns Scotus* in Sent. L. i. Dist. 40. in Resol. (quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by *Von Cölln*, p. 155): Divina autem voluntas circa ipsas creaturas libere et contingenter se habet. Quocirca contingenter salvandos prædestinat, et posset eosdem non prædestinare. Dist. 17. Qu. 1. in Resol.....Actus meritorius est in potestate hominis, supposita generali influentia, si habuerit liberi arbitrii usum et gratiam, sed completio in ratione meriti non est in potestate hominis nisi dispositive, sic tamen dispositive, quod ex dispositione divina nobis revelata. [*Duns Scotus* considers prædestination under a twofold aspect—as an act of the divine will, and of the divine intellect: in the latter sense it is the—præcognitio, quam habet Deus salutis electorum; quæ quidem præcognitio concomitatur et consequitur electionem.]

[6] *Thomas of Bradwardine*, surnamed Doctor profundus, was born at Hartfield, in the county of Sussex (about the year 1290), well read in the works of Plato and Aristotle, was master of Merton College, confessor of King Edward III., archbishop of Canterbury, and died A. D. 1349. In his work entitled: De Causa Dei contra Pelagium et de Virtute Causarum, ad suos Mertonenses, lib. iii. (edited by Savil. Lond. 1618, fol.), extracts from which are given by Schröckh, Kirchengeschichte xxxiv. p. 227 ss. he complained, that *almost the whole world had fallen into the errors of Pelagianism.* In his principles he agreed, on the whole, with Augustine and Anselm, though some of his notions appear more rigid than those of Augustine himself. Among other things, he lowered the free will of man so much, as to represent it as a servant who is following its mistress (*i. e.*, the Divine will),

an idea which can not but be called mechanical. Comp. *Schröckh*, l. c. *Münscher*, edit. by *Von Cölln*, pp. 156, 157.) "*That these repulsive (wholly necessarian) positions were so unnoticed and unopposed, can only be explained by the fact, that the theologians of the 14th century were so absorbed in fruitless subtleties, that they had hardly any interest left in those parts of theology which are of chief practical importance.*" *Gieseler* in Dogmengesch. 524. [See *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 609.]

[1] *Wycliffe*, Trialog. Lib. ii. c. 14: Videtur mihi probabile....quod Deus necessitat creaturas singulas activas ad quemlibet actum suum. Et sic sunt aliqui *prædestinati*, *h. e.* post laborem ordinati ad gloriam, aliqui *præsciti*, *h. e.* post vitam miseram ad pœnam perpetuam ordinati. Compare also what follows where this idea is more fully discussed in a scholastico-speculative manner. [On *Wycliffe*, comp. *Neander*, Church Hist. and Hist. Dogm. 610. *Böhringer*, p. 139. *Neander* says, "His doctrine of ideas is developed in opposition to the nominalist view of the relation of thought to being, and of an infinite series of possibilities, and leads him, according to his own strict logic, to an unconditional predestination. God's omnipotence and the actual creation are counterparts: Sicut Deus ad intra nihil potest producere, nisi absolute necessario illud producat, sic nihil ad extra potest producere, nisi pro suo tempore producat.....Deus nihil intelligit nisi quod existit, dum potest existere, et sic omne quod existere potest existit.] *Wessel* views the atonement, sometimes as general, and again as limited. Christ suffered for all, but his sufferings will avail to any man only as far as he shows susceptibility for them; the susceptibility itself is proportioned to the amount of his inward purity, and to the degree in which his life is conformable to that of Christ: De Magnit. Pass. c. 10, quoted by *Ullmann*, pp. 271, 272.—On *Savonarola's* more liberal views on the doctrine of predestination, see *Rudelbach*, p. 361 ss. and *Meier*, p. 269 ss.

§ 185.

APPROPRIATION OF GRACE.

[1] *Rettberg*, Scholasticorum Placita de Gratia et Merito. Göttingen, 1836.

Though Augustine had demonstrated, with logical strictness, the natural corruption of mankind, unconditional election by the free grace of God, and the efficacy of that grace, he yet gave no precise statements about the appropriation of the grace of God on the part of man, justification, sanctification, etc.[1] It was in consequence of this very deficiency that Semipelagianism again found its way into the Church. *Thomas Aquinas* understood by justification, not only the acquittal of the sinner from punishment, but also the communication of divine life (infusio gratiæ) from the hand of God, which takes place at the same time.[2] It was also possible to advance very different definitions of the idea of grace; some re-

garded it (from the theological point of view) as an attribute, or an act of God, while others looked upon it (in its bearing upon anthropology) as a religious and moral energy, working in man, and forming a part of the essence of regeneration. Hence *Peter Lombard* and *Thomas Aquinas* distinguished between *gratia gratis dans*, *gratia gratis data*, and *gratia gratum faciens*, the last of which was further divided into *gratia operans*, and *gratia co-operans* (prævenions and comitans.)[3] Concerning the certainty of divine grace, not only Thomas Aquinas, but also *Tauler*, still entertained doubts;[4] while the mystics, generally speaking, attempted to point out more definitely the various steps and degrees of the higher life wrought by the Holy Spirit in the regenerate, and to describe in detail the inward processes of enlightening, awakening, etc.[5] On the other hand, the fanatical sects of the middle ages, inclining to pantheism, lost sight of the serious character of sanctification in the fantastic intoxication of feeling.[6]

[1] See vol. i. § 114.

[2] *Thomas*, Summ. P. ii. 1. Qu. 100. Art. 12 (quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by Von Cölln, p. 147.) : Justificatio primo ac proprie dicitur *factio justitiæ*, secundario vero et quasi improprie potest dici justificatio significatio justitiæ, vel *dispositio ad justitiam*. Sed si loquamur de justificatione proprie dicta, justitia potest accipi prout est in habitu, vel prout est in actu. Et secundum hoc justificatio dupliciter dicitur, uno quidem modo, secundum quod homo fit justus adipiscens *habitum* justitiæ, alio vero modo, secundum quod *opera justitiæ operatur*, ut secundum hoc justificatio nihil aliud sit quam *justitiæ executio*. Justitia autem, sicut et aliæ *virtutes*, potest accipi et *acquisita*, *et infusa*.....Acquisita quidem causatur ex operibus, sed infusa causatur ab ipso Deo per ejus gratiam. Comp. Qu. 113. Art. 1, quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by Von Cölln, l. c. [Comp. *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 574.]

[3] *Peter Lombard*, Sent. ii. Dist. 27. D. [The *Lombard* says (ii. d. 26) : Operans gratia est, quæ prævenit voluntatem bonam, ea enim liberatur et præparatur hominis voluntas, ut sit bona, bonamque efficaciter velit. Cooperans vero gratia voluntatem jam bonam sequitur adjuvando.] *Thomas Aquinas*, Summ. P. iii. Qu. 2. Art. 10 (quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by Von Cölln, p. 140 ss.) According to *Aquinas*, God works good in us without our coöperation, but not without our consent : Summa P. i. qu. 55, Art. 4 : Virtus infusa causatur in nobis a Deo sine nobis agentibus, non tamen sine nobis consentientibus. Comp. *Ritter*, viii. 341. [*Aquinas*, P. II, 1. qu. 109, Art. 6 : Conversio hominis ad Deum fit quidem per liberum arbitrium, et secundum hoc homini præcipitur quod se ad Deum convertat. Sed liberum arbitrium ad Deum converti non potest, nisi Deo ipsum ad se convertente.—Hominis est præparare animam, quia hoc facit per liberum arbitrium ; sed tamen hoc non facit sine auxilio Dei moventis et ad se attrahentis.] Man's coöperation is much more insisted upon by *Duns Scotus* than by Thomas, Sentent. lib. iii. dist. 34, 35 : Deus dedit habitum voluntatis, semper assistit voluntati et habitui ad actus sibi convenientes. We are not to conceive of

grace as infused into man, like fire into a stick of wood: see *Ritter*, ubi supra, 372. *Baur*, Lehrb. 189. *Gieseler*, Dogmengesch. 523. [Scotus could not admit an unconditional predestination. The differences of these teachers were perpetuated in the Franciscans and Dominicans.—The *gratia gratis dans* is the efficient principle; the *gratia gratis data* is the grace imparted—virtue in man.—On the views of *Robert Pulleyn*, see *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 525. On *Hugo of St. Victor*, see *Schöpff's* Aurora, iv. 44.]

[a] *Aquinas* supposed (Summa P. ii. 1, Qu. 112, Art. 5) a threefold way in which man could ascertain whether he was a subject of divine grace or not; 1. By direct revelation on the part of God; 2. By himself (certitudinaliter); 3. By certain indications (conjecturalitur per aliqua signa.) But the last two were, in his opinion, uncertain; as for the first, God very seldom makes use of it, and only in particular cases (revelat Deus hoc aliquando aliquibus ex speciali privilegio.) [*Alexander of Hales* contended for a special knowledge on this point: Scientia affectus per experientiam rei in affectu. See *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 586.] *Luther* denounced this notion of the uncertainty of man being in a state of grace (in his Comment. upon Gal. iv. 6), as a dangerous and sophistical doctrine. Nevertheless *Tauler* entertained the same opinion, Predigten, vol. i. p. 67: No man on earth is either so good, or so blessed, or so well informed in holy doctrine, as to know whether he is made a subject of the grace of God or not, unless it be made known to him by a special revelation of God. If a man will but examine himself, it will be evident enough to him that he does not know; thus the desire of knowing proceeds from ignorance, as if a child would know what a sovereign has in his heart. Accordingly, as he who is diseased in body is to believe his physician, who knows the nature of his disease better than himself, so man must trust in some modest confessor.

[b] According to *Bonaventura*, the grace of God manifests itself in a threefold way. 1. In habitus virtutum; 2. In habitus donorum; 3. In habitus beatitudinum (Breviloquium v. 4, ss., comp. *Richard of St. Victor*, quoted by *Engelhardt*, p. 30, ss.). A lively picture of the mystical doctrine of salvation is given by the author of the work, Büchlein von der Deutschen Theologie, where he shows how Adam must die, and Christ live in us. In his opinion, *purification*, *illumination*, and *union*, are the three principal degrees. The last in particular (unio mystica) is to be brought forward as the aim and crown of the whole. According to ch. 25 of this work, it (union) consists in this: "that we are pure, single-minded, and, in the pursuit of truth, are entirely one with the one eternal will of God; or that *we have not any will at all of our own; or that the will of the creature flows into the will of the eternal Creator, and is so blended with it, and annihilated by it, that the eternal will alone wills, acts, and suffers in us.*" Comp. ch. 30. "Behold, man in that state wills or desires nothing but good as such, and for no other reason but because it is good, and not because it is this thing or that, nor because it pleases one or displeases another, nor because it is pleasant or unpleasant, sweet or bitter, etc.... for all selfishness, egoism, and man's own interest have ceased, and fallen into oblivion; no longer is it said, I love myself, or I love you, or such and such a thing. And if you would ask Charity, what dost thou love? she would say, I love good. And why? she would say,

because it is good. And because it is good, it is also good, and right, and well done, that it may be right well desired and loved. *And if my own self were better than God, then I ought to love it above God.* On that account God does not love himself as God, but as the highest good. For if God knew anything better than God, etc. (comp. vol. i. § 168, note 3).... Behold, thus it ought to be, and really is, in a godly person, or in a truly sanctified man, for otherwise he could neither be godly nor sanctified." Ch. 33. "Now, it might be asked, what man is godly or sanctified? The reply is, he who is illuminated and enlightened with the eternal or divine light, and kindled with eternal or divine love, is a godly or sanctified person.... *We ought to know, that light and knowledge are nothing, and are good for nothing, without charity.*" (He distinguishes, however, between the true light and the false, between true love and false love), etc. *Tauler* expressed himself in similar terms (Predigten i. p. 117): "He who has devoted himself to God, and surrendered himself prisoner to him for ever, may expect that God, in his turn, will surrender himself prisoner to him; and, overcoming all obstacles, and opening all prisons, God will lead man to the divine liberty, viz., to himself. Then man will, in some respects, be rather a divine being than a natural man. And if you touch man you touch God; he who would see and confess the former, must see and confess him in God. Here all wounds are healed, and all pledges are remitted; here the transition is made from the creature to God, from the natural being, in some respect, to a divine being. This loving reciprocation is above our apprehension, it is above all sensible or perceptible ways, and above natural methods. Those who are within, and are what we have described, are in much the nearest and best way, and in the path to much the greatest blessedness, where they will ever enjoy God in the highest possible degree. It is far better to remain silent on those points than to speak of them, better to perceive, or to feel, than to understand them."—*Suso*,* speaking of the unio mystica, in his treatise entitled, Büchlein von der ewigen Weisheit, Lib. ii. c. 7, expressed himself poetically as follows (quoted by *Diepenbrock*, p. 275): "O thou gentle and lovely flower of the field, thou beloved bride in the embraces of the soul, loving with a pure love, how happy is he who ever truly felt what it is to possess thee; but how strange is it to hear a man [talk of thee] who does not know thee, and whose heart and mind are yet carnal! O thou precious, thou incomprehensible good, this hour is a happy one, this present time is a sweet one, in which I must open to thee a secret wound which thy sweet love has inflicted upon my heart. Lord, thou knowest that sharing in love is like water in fire; thou knowest that true, heartfelt love, can not endure a duality. O thou! the only Lord of my heart and soul, therefore my heart desires that thou shouldst love me with a special love, and that thy divine eyes would take a special delight in me. O Lord! thou hast so many hearts which love thee with a heartfelt love, and prevail much with thee; alas! thou tender and dear Lord! how is it then with me?" *Ruysbroek* treated very fully of the mystical doctrine of salvation (quoted by *Engelhardt*, p.

* On the further views of Suso as to the method of salvation, and its three degrees (purgatio, illuminatio, perfectio), see *Schmidt*, ubi supra, 48. To float in divinity, as the eagle in the air, is the end of his aspirations, p. 50.

190, ss.) In his opinion, man attains unto God by an active, an inward, and a contemplative life. The first has regard rather to the external (exercises of penance.) Only when man *loves*, do his desires take an opposite direction. When our spirits turn entirely to the light, viz., God, all will be made perfect in us, and be restored to its primitive state. We are united to the light, and, by the grace of God, are born again, of grace, above nature. The eternal light itself brings forth four lights in us: 1. The natural light of heaven, which we have in common with the animals; 2. The light of the highest heaven, by which we behold, as it were, with our bodily senses, the glorified body of Christ and the saints; 3. The spiritual light (the natural intelligence of angels and men); 4. The light of the grace of God.—Concerning the three unities in man, the three advents of Christ, the four processions, the three meetings, the gifts of the Holy Spirit, etc., as well as the various degrees of the contemplative life, the degrees of love, see *Engelhardt*, l. c.—*Savonarola* described (in his Sermons) the state of grace as an act of sealing on the part of the Lord; Jesus Christ, the crucified one, is the seal with which the sinner is sealed after he has done penance, and received a new heart. The billows of temporal afflictions can not quench the fire of this love, etc.; nevertheless, grace does not work irresistibly, man may resist, as well as lose it. Respecting Savonarola's views on the doctrine of the uncertainty of a state of grace, see *Rudelbach*, p. 364, and *Meier*, p. 272.

[6] See the Episcopal letter quoted by Mosheim, p. 256: Item dicunt, quod homo possit sic uniri Deo, quod ipsius sit idem posse ac velle et operari quodcunque, quod est ipsius Dei. Item credunt, se esse Deum per naturam sine distinctione. Item, quod sint in eis omnes perfectiones divinæ, ita quod dicunt, se esse æternos, et in æternitate. Item dicunt, se omnia creasse, et plus creasse, quam Deus. Item, quod nullo indigent nec Deo nec Deitate. Item, quod sunt impeccabiles, unde quemcunque actum peccati faciunt sine peccato (compare vol. i. § 165, note 2.)—The opinions of *Master Eckert* on on this question were also pantheistic: Nos transformamur totaliter in Deum et convertimur in eum simili modo, sicut in sacramento convertitur panis in Corpus Christi: sic ego convertor in eum, quod ipse operatur in me suum esse. Unum non simile per viventem Deum verum est, quod nulla ibi est distinctio. (Cf. *Raynald*, Annal. ad a. 1329.) He was opposed by *Gerson*; see *Hundeshagen*, p. 66.

§ 186.

FAITH AND GOOD WORKS. THE MERITORIOUSNESS OF THE LATTER.

Though many of the scholastics were inclined to Pelagianism, yet the doctrine of *justification by faith* had to be retained as Pauline. But then the difficult question was, what we are to understand by *faith*. *John Damascenus* had already represented faith as consisting in two things, viz., a belief in the truth of the doctrines, and a firm confidence in the promises of God.[1] *Hugo of St. Victor* also de-

fined faith, on the one hand, as *cognitio*, and on the other, as *affectus*.[2] And lastly, the distinction made by *Peter Lombard* between *credere Deum*, *credere Deo*, and *credere in Deum*[3] shows that he too acknowledged a difference in the usage of the term "faith." Only the last kind of faith was regarded by the scholastics as fides justificans, fides formata.[4] The most eminent theologians both perceived and taught that *this* kind of faith must of itself produce good works.[5] Nevertheless, the theory of the meritoriousness of good works was developed, in connection with ecclesiastical practice. Though the distinction made by *Aquinas* between *meritum ex condigno* and *meritum ex congruo*, seemed to limit human claims, yet it only secured the appearance of humility.[6] But the evil grew still worse, when the notion of supererogatory works, which may be imputed to those who have none of their own, became one of the most dangerous supports of the sale of indulgences.[7] There were, however, even at that time, some who strenuously opposed such abuses.[8]

[1] De Fide Orth. iv. 10: Ἡ μέντοι πίστις διπλῆ ἐστιν· ἔστι γὰρ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς (Rom. x. 17). Ἀκούοντες γὰρ τῶν θείων γραφῶν, πιστεύομεν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Αὕτη δὲ τελειοῦται πᾶσι τοῖς νομοθετηθεῖσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἔργῳ πιστεύουσα, εὐσεβοῦσα καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς πράττουσα τοῦ ἀνακαινίσαντος ἡμᾶς..... Ἔστι δὲ πάλιν πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις (Hebr. xi. 1), πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων, ἡ ἀδίστακτος καὶ ἀδιάκριτος ἐλπὶς τῶν τε ὑπὸ θεοῦ ἡμῖν ἐπηγγελμένων, καὶ τῆς τῶν αἰτήσεων ἡμῶν ἐπιτυχίας. Ἡ μὲν οὖν πρώτη τῆς ἡμετέρας γνώμης ἐστὶ, ἡ δὲ δευτέρα τῶν χαρισμάτων τοῦ πνεύματος.

[2] On the difference between these two terms, compare *Liebner*, p. 435. [*Hugo St. Victor*: De Sacramentis, liber 1, part x. cap. 3: Duo sunt, in quibus fides constat: *cognitio et affectus*, *i. e.*, constantia vel firmitas credendi. In altero constat quia ipsa illud est; in altero constat, quia ipsa in illo est. In affectu enim substantia fidei invenitur; in cognitione materia. Aliud enim est fides, qua creditur, et aliud, quod creditur. In affectu invenitur fides, in cognitione id, quod fide creditur.]

[3] Sent. L. iii. Dist. 23, D: Aliud est enim credere in Deum, aliud credere Deo, aliud credere Deum. Credere Deo, est credere vera essa quæ loquitur, quod et mali faciunt. Et nos credimus homini, sed non in hominem. Credere Deum, est credere quod ipse sit Deus, quod etiam mali faciunt [this kind of faith was sometimes called the faith of devils, according to James ii. 19]. Credere in Deum est credendo amare, credendo in eum ire, credendo ei adhærere et ejus membris incorporari. Per hanc fidem justificatur impius, ut deinde ipsa fides incipiat per dilectionem operari.—The same holds true of the phrase, credere Christum, etc. Comp. Lit. C.

[4] Generally speaking, the scholastics made a difference between subjective and objective faith, fides *qua*, and fides *quæ* creditur (*Peter Lombard*, l. c.) As a subdivision, we find mentioned fides formata, which works by love. Faith without love remains informis, see *Lombard*, l. c.: *Thomas Aquinas*, Summ. P. ii. 2, Qu. 4, Art. 3 (quoted by *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 175.)

So, too, a distinction was made between developed and undeveloped faith (fides explicita et implicita); the latter is sufficient, see Summa, ii. Qu. 1, Art 7: Qu. 2, Art. 6 and 7.

[5] Thus *Peter Lombard* said, l. c.: Sola bona opera dicenda sunt, quæ fiunt per dilectionem Dei. Ipsa enim dilectio opus fidei dicitur.—Faith would therefore still be the source of good works; comp. Lib. ii. Dist. 41, A. where every thing which does not proceed from faith (according to Rom. xiv. 23) is represented as sin.—The views of *Thomas Aquinas* were not quite so scriptural; Summ. P. ii. 2, Qu. 4, Art. 7, he spoke of faith itself as a *virtue*, though he assigned to it the first and highest place among all virtues. Such notions, however, led more and more to the revival of Pelagian sentiments, till the forerunners of the Reformation returned to the simple truths of the Gospel. This was done *e. g.*, by *Wessel* (see Ullmann, p. 272, ss.) and *Savonarola* (see *Rudelbach*, p. 351, ss.) On the other hand, even the Waldenses laid much stress upon works of repentance. *Thomas à Kempis* did not start from the central point of the doctrine of justification in *such* a measure and manner, as did the above: see *Ullmann* ubi supra. [Comp. Chalmers, Essay prefixed to the Imitation.]

[6] *Alanus ab Insulis* also opposed the notion of the meritoriousness of works in decided terms, ii. 18 (quoted by *Pez*, i. p. 492): Bene mereri proprie dicitur, qui sponte alicui benefacit, quod facere non tenetur. Sed nihil Deo facimus, quod non tenemur facere.....Ergo meritum nostrum apud Deum non est *proprie* meritum, sed solutio debiti. Sed non est merces nisi meriti vel debiti præcedentis. Sed non meremur proprie, ergo quod dabitur a Deo, non erit proprie merces, sed gratia.—Some theologians regarded *faith* itself as meritorious (inasmuch as they considered it to be a work, a virtue—obedience to the Church.) *Thomas Aq.* P. ii. 2, Qu. 2, Art. 9.—On the distinction made between different kinds of merita, see P. ii. 1, Qu. 114, Art. 4, quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 145. Men have only a meritum ex congruo, but not ex condigno. Christ alone possessed the latter. [The *meritum de condigno*, strict merit, can not possibly be attained by a creature—on this ground man could not make himself worthy of grace. The *meritum de congruo*, or, *imputativum*, presupposes that grace is connected with certain conditions, in which man may have a part to perform, by which he may earn this grace.]

[7] The development of the doctrine of a thesaurus meritorum, thesaurus supererogationis, belongs to *Alexander of Hales* (Summa, Pars. iv. Quæst. 23, Art. 2, memb. 5). To this was added the distinction made by Thomas Aquinas between consilium and præceptum, see Summ. P. ii. Qu. 108, Art. 4, quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Colln, p. 177. [Præceptum importat necessitatem: consilium autem in optione ponitur ejus cui datur.... *Supra præcepta sunt addita consilia*....Consilia vero oportet esse de illis per quæ melius et expeditius potest homo consequi finem prædictum.] On the historical development of indulgencies, see † (*Eus.*) *Amort*, Historia....de Origine, Progressu, Valore et Fructu Indulgentiarum, Venet., 1738, fol. *Gieseler*, Church Hist. (N. Y. ed.), ii. 196, 518, iii. 162, 393. *Ullmann*, Reformat. vor d. Ref. i. 203. †*Hirscher*, Die Lehre vom Ablass, Tüb., 1844. [G. E. Steitz, d. römische Busssacrament, Frankf., 1853.—Clement VI. in the *Con-*

stitutio Unigenitus, 1343, for the jubilee of 1350, granted large indulgences, founded on this treasury of grace, and stated the whole doctrine explicitly.—Innocent III., in 1213, issued indulgences for the crusaders, in very broad terms, saying to all who took part—plenam suorum peccaminum de quibus veraciter fuerint corde contriti et ore confessi, veniam indulgemus, et in retributione justorum salutis æternæ pollicemur augmentum.—*Albertus Mag.* Sent. iv. d. 20, 16, defines: Indulgentia sive relaxatio est remissio pœnæ injunctæ ex vi clavium et thesauro supererogationis perfectorum procedens.... In hoc enim thesauro habet ecclesia divitias meritorum et passionis Christi et gloriosæ virginis Mariæ et omnium apostolorum et martyrum et sanctorum Dei vivorum et mortuorum. *Thomas Aquinas*, III. in Suppl. 25, a. 1, gives the rationale of the matter: Ratio autem, quare valere possint, est unitas corporis mystici, in qua multi in operibus pœnitentiæ supererogaverunt ad mensuram debitorum suorum, et multi etiam tribulationes injustas sustinuerunt patienter, per quas multitudo pœnarum poterat expiari, si eis deberetur; quorum meritorum tanta est copia quod omnem pœnam debitam nunc viventibus excedunt; et præcipue propter meritum Christi....Sic prædicta merita communia sunt totius ecclesiæ. Comp. *Schmid*, Lehrb. d. Dogmengesch. 122.]

[8] Thus the Franciscan monk, *Berthold*, in the thirteenth century, zealously opposed the penny-preachers who seduced the souls of men (see *Kling*, pp. 149, 150, 235, 289, 384, 395; *Grimm*, p. 210; *Wackernagel*, deutsches Lesebuch i. Sp. 664). On the struggles of *Wycliffe*, *Hus*, and others, see the works on Ecclesiastical History. Concerning the treatise of Hus: De Indulgentiis, compare Schröckh, xxxiv. p. 599, ss. Besides, the actual exercises of penance on the part of the Flagellantes, and those who tormented themselves, formed a practical opposition to the laxity of principle. See *Gieseler*, l. c.

SIXTH DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS.

§ 187.

THE CHURCH.

Even in the preceding period, the idea of the Church had become confounded with its external manifestation, and thus the way was prepared for all the abuses of the Romish hierarchy, and the development of the papacy. The relation in which the ecclesiastical power stands to the secular (or the church to the state), was often illustrated by the comparison of the two swords, which some supposed to be separated, while others thought them united in the hand of Peter.[1] It belongs, properly speaking, to the province of Canon Law, to develop and define those relations; but, inasmuch as adherence to the decisions of ecclesiastical authorities on such matters was supposed to form a part of orthodoxy, and as every species of dissent appeared not only heretical, but as the most dangerous of all heresies, it is obvious that they are not to be passed over with silence in the history of doctrines. That which exerted the greatest influence upon the doctrinal tendency of the present age, was the dogma of the papal power and infallibility, in opposition to the position that the council is superior to the Pope.[2] The mystical idea of the church, and the notion of a universal priesthood, which was intimately connected with it, was propounded, with more or less definiteness, by *Hugo of St. Victor*, as well as by the forerunners of the Reformation, *Wycliffe*, *Matthias of Janow*, *Hus*, *John of Wesel*, *Wessel*, and *Savonarola*.[3] The antihierarchical element referred to, and together with it the antiecclesiastical, manifested itself nowhere so strongly as in the fanatical sects of the middle ages, whose principles also led them sometimes to oppose not only Christianity, but also the existing political governments.[4] On the other hand, the Waldenses and Bohemian brethren endeavored, in a simple way, and without fanaticism, to return to the foundation laid by the apostles: overlooking, however, the historical development of the Church.[5]

[1] This is more fully shown in the work entitled: Vridankes Bescheidenheit,* edit. by *Grimm*, Gött. 1834, p. lvii.—*Bernard of Clairval* already interpreted the words of Luke xxii. 36–38, in a figurative sense; Epist. ad Eugen. 256 (written A. D. 1146); in agreement with him, *John of Salisbury* (Polic. iv. 3) asserted, that both the swords are in the hands of the Pope, but yet the Pope ought to wield the secular sword by the arm of the Emperor. On the other hand, the Emperor Frederic I. referred the *one* of the two swords to the power of the Pope, the *other* to that of the Emperor (see the letters written A. D. 1157, 1160, 1167, in the work of *Grimm*). The Emperor Otto maintained the same in opposition to Pope Innocent III. Since it was *Peter* (according to John xviii. 10) who drew the sword, the advocates of the Papal system inferred, that *both* the swords ought to be in *one* hand, and that the Pope had only to lend it to the Emperor. Such was the reasoning, *e. g.*, of the Franciscan monk, *Berthold*. On the contrary, others, as *Freidank*, *Reinmar of Zweter*, and the author of the work entitled: *Der Sachsenspiegel*, insisted that the power was to be divided; in a note to the Sachsenspiegel, it is assumed that Christ gave only one of the two swords to the Apostle Peter, but the other, the secular one, to the Apostle John. The opposite view was defended in the work called "der Schwabenspiegel." Further particulars are given by Grimm, l. c. [Compare also Gieseler ii. § 55, note 13.]—There were also not wanting those who advocated the freedom of the church in opposition to the secular as well as the spiritual domination. Thus *John of Salisbury* maintained the principle: Ecclesiastica debent esse liberrima: see his 95th Epistle and the collection of *Masson* (in *Ritter*, Gesh. d. Phil. viii. 50, Note).

[2] Compare *e. g.* the bull issued by Pope Boniface VIII. A. D. 1302 (in Extravag. Commun. Lib. i. Tit. viii. cap. 1.), and the decision of the Synod of Basle, Sess. i. the 19. Jul. 1431, in which the opposite doctrine was set forth. (*Mansi* T. xxix. Cod. 21: both in *Münscher*, edit. by Von Cölln, p. 316–18.)

[3] According to *Hugo of St. Victor* (de Sacram. Lib. ii. P. iii. quoted by Liebner, p. 445, ss.), Christ is the invisible head of the Church, and the multitudo fidelium is his body. The Church, as a whole, is divided into two halves (walls), the laity and the clergy (the left side and the right side). As much as the spirit is above the body, so much is the ecclesiastical power above the secular. On that account, the former has the right not only to institute the latter, but also to judge it when it is corrupt. But since the ecclesiastical power itself is instituted by God, it can be judged only by God when it turns from the right path (1 Cor. vi.) Hugo also acknowledged the Pope as the vicarius Petri. He conceded to him the privilege of being served by all ecclesiastics, and the unlimited power of binding and loosing all things upon earth.—*Wycliffe* made a much more precise distinction between the idea of the Church, and the external ecclesiastical power,

* The passage in *Vridank* reads (p. 152):

Zwei swert in einer scheide
verderbent lihte beide;
als der bâbest rîches gert,
sô verderbent beidin swert.

than Hugo (see the extracts from the Trialogus given by *Schröckh*, xxxiv. p. 510, ss., and his other writings of an antihierarchical tendency, ibid. p. 547.) *Neander*, Church History (Torrey) v. 173 sq.: Hist. Dogmas, 613. *Böhringer*, 409. *Vaughan's* Life of W.—*Lechler* in Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol. 1853.) Still more definite was *Matthias of Janow* (De Regulis Vet. Novique Test.), who says, that seeming Christians can no more be regarded as Christians, than a painted man can be called a man: comp. *Neander*, ubi supra. *Hus*, in his treatise De Ecclesia, distinguishes between three forms of manifestation of the Church: 1. Ecclesia *triumphans*, *i. e.*, beati in patria quiescentes, qui adversus Satanam militiam Christi tenentes, finaliter triumpharunt; 2. Ecclesia *dormiens*, *i. e.*, numerus prædestinatorum in purgatorio patiens; 3. Ecclesia *militans*, *i. e.*, ecclesia prædestinatorum, dum hic viat ad patriam. From this true church, at present represented in these three forms, he distinguishes, again, the ecclesia nuncupative dicta (the ecclesia of the *præsciti*); Quidam sunt in ecclesia nomine et re, ut *prædestinati*, obedientes Christo catholici; quidam nec re nec nomine, ut præsciti pagani: quidam nomine tantum, ut præsciti hypocritæ; et quidam re, licet videantur nomine esse foris, ut prædestinati Christiani, quos Antichristi satrapæ videntur in facie ecclesiæ condemnare (among whom Hus probably reckoned himself). Comp. further in *Münchmeier*, ubi supra, p. 16. *Hase*, Kirchengeschichte, p. 387, says of him:—"*Hus ascended from the idea of the Roman Church to the idea of the true Church, which was in his opinion the community of all who have from eternity been predestinated to blessedness, and whose head can be none but Christ himself, and not the Pope. As Hus, however, retained all the assertions concerning the Church made by the Roman Catholics, and applied them to the said community of the elect, who alone can administer the sacraments in an efficient way, his Church must necessarily have assumed the character of an association of separatists.*" On the relation of the views of Hus to those of *Gerson*, see *Münchmeier*, u. s. 18 Note. Hus's friend, *Nicolas de Clemangis*, also, in agreement with Hus, regarded the vital faith of the individual as the real living principle, by which the dead church was to be revived; hence his declaration: In sola potest mulierecula per gratiam manere ecclesia, sicut in sola Virgine tempore passionis mansisse creditur (Disputatio de Concil. General). Comp. *Münz*, Nic. Clémanges, sa vie et ses écrits, Strasb. 1846. [Comp. on Clemangis, and Hus and Wycliffe, Presb. Quarterly, 1856–8.] *John von Wesel* (Disp. adv. Indulgent.), starting from the different definitions of the word ecclesia, shows, that we can equally well say, ecclesia universalis non errat, and, ecclesia universalis errat. Only the church founded on the rock is to him, sancta et immaculata; and he distinguishes from this, the church—peccatrix et adultera. *John Wessel* held that the Church consists in the community of saints, to which all truly pious Christians belong—viz. those who are united to Christ by *one* faith, *one* hope, and *one* love (he did not exclude the Greek Christians). The external unity of the Church under the Pope is merely accidental; nor is the unity spoken of established by the decrees of councils. (Hyperboreans, Indians, and Scythians, who know nothing of the councils of Constance or Basle!) But he considered love to be still more excellent than the unity of faith. In close adherence to the principle of Augustine (Evangelio non

crederem, etc.) which he regarded as a subjective concession, he believed *with* the Church, and *according* to the Church, but not *in* the Church. Respecting the priesthood he retained the distinction between laity and clergy, but at the same time admitted the doctrine of a universal priesthood, together with the particular priesthood of the clergy. Nor does the Church exist for the sake of the clergy, but, on the contrary, the clergy exist for the sake of the Church. Comp. *Ullmann*, p. 296, ss. (after the various essays, De dignitate et potestate ecclesiastica, De sacramento pœnitentiæ, De communione Sanctorum et thesauro ecclesiæ, collected in the Farrago Rerum Theologicarum), and *Münchmeier*, p. 19.—According to *Savonarola*, the Church is composed of all those who are united in the bonds of love and of Christian truth, by the grace of the Holy Spirit; *and the Church is not there, where this grace does not exist;* see the passages collected from his sermons in *Rudelbach*, p. 354, ss., and *Meier*, p. 282, ss. Respecting the mystical interpretation of the ark of the covenant as having regard to the Church, see ibid.

[4] Compare *Mosheim*, p. 257: Dicunt, se credere, ecclesiam catholicam sive christianitatem fatuam esse vel fatuitatem. Item, quod homo perfectus sit liber in totum, quod tenetur ad servandum præcepta data ecclesiæ a Deo, sicut est præceptum de honoratione parentum in necessitate. Item, quod ratione hujus libertatis homo non tenetur ad servandum præcepta Prælatorum et statutorum ecclesiæ, et hominem fortem, etsi non religiosum, non obligari ad labores manuales pro necessitatibus suis, sed eum libere posse recipere eleemosynam pauperum. Item dicunt, se credere omnia esse communia, unde dicunt, furtum eis licitum esse.

[5] Comp. *Gieseler*, Church History ii. § 86. *Herzog*, Waldenser, 194 sq.

§ 188.

THE WORSHIP OF SAINTS.

[Rev. *J. B. Morris*, Jesus the Son of Mary; on the Reverence shown by Catholics to his Blessed Mother. Lond. 2 vols. 1851: comp. Brownson's Review, July, 1852 and 1853. Kitto's Journal, April, 1852. *J. H. Horne*, Mariolatry of Rome, edited by Jarvis, 1850. Dublin Review, on Worship of Saints, April, 1853. *Pusey*, on Rule of Faith, pp. 55–60. *Newman*, on Development, 173–80. A review of Liguori's Glories of Mary, discussing the patristic testimony, in Christian Remembrancer, Lond. Oct. 1855.]

The hierarchical system of the Papacy, which was reared like a lofty pyramid upon earth, was supposed to correspond to a supposed hierarchy in heaven, at the head of which was Mary, the mother of God.[1] The objection of the polytheistic tendency of this doctrine, which would naturally suggest itself to reflecting minds, was met by the scholastics of the Greek Church by making a distinction between λατρεία and προσκύνησις; by those of the Latin Church, by distinguishing between *Latria, Dulia,* and *Hyperdulia.*[2] But such

distinctions were by no means safeguards against practical abuses; in consequence of these, the forerunners of the Reformation were induced to oppose, with all energy, the worship of saints.[3]

[1] The adoration of the Virgin (Mariolatry) was countenanced by *John Damascenus* among the Greeks, and by *Peter Damiani*, *Bernard of Clairval*, *Bonaventura*,* and other theologians of the Western Church; see Gieseler, l. c. ii. § 78, (where passages from the songs of the Minnesingers are quoted); *Münscher*, edit. by Von Cölln, p. 180–82; and De Gratiis et Virtutibus beatæ Mariæ Virg., in *Pez*, Thes. Anecdd. T. i. p. 509 ss. To these we may add a passage from *Tauler*, Predigt. auf unser lieben Frauen Verkündigung (Predigten, vol. iii. p. 57). Tauler calls Mary, "the daughter of the Father, the mother of the Son, the bride of the Holy Spirit, the queen of heaven, the lady of the world and of all creatures, the mother and intercessor of all those who implore her help, a temple of God, in which God has reposed, like a bridegroom in his chamber, with great pleasure and delight; as in a garden full of every kind of odoriferous herbs, he found in the virgin all kinds of virtues and gifts. By means of these virtues she has made the heaven of the Holy Trinity pour out honey upon wretched sinners such as we, and has brought to us the Sun of Righteousness, and abolished the curse of Eve, and crushed the head of the devilish serpent. This second Eve has restored, by her child, all that the first Eve lost and marred, and has provided much more grace and riches. She is the star that was to come out of Jacob (of which the Scripture foretold—Numb. xxiv. 17), whose lustre imparts light to the whole world: accordingly, in every distress (says Bernard) fix thy eyes upon that star, call upon Mary, and thou canst not despair; follow Mary, and thou canst not miss thy way. She will keep thee by the power of her child, lest thou fall in the way; she will protect thee, lest thou despair; she will conduct thee to her child; she is able to perform it, *for God Almighty is her child;* she is willing to do it, for she is merciful. Who could doubt for a moment that the child would not honor his mother, or that *she* does not overflow with love, in whom perfect love (*i. e.*, God himself) has reposed?"†—Besides Mary, it was especially the apostles of Christ, the martyrs, those who had taken an active part in the spread of Christianity, the founders of national churches, the greatest lights in the Church, and ascetics, and lastly, monks and nuns in particular, that were canonized. Imagination itself created some new (mythical) saints, *e. g.*, St. Longinus; and in fine, some of the men and women mentioned in the Old Testament came in for their share in the general adoration. The right of canonizing formerly possessed by the bishops was more and more claimed by the popes; for particulars, see the works on Ecclesiastical History.

* Comp. the Psalterium beatæ Mariæ Virginis, of the 13th century. [This is not by Bonaventura, comp. *Gieseler*. On this Psalter, see Southern Presb. Review, Jan. 1855.]

† The mother of Jesus appears as an intercessor before her Son, who is for the most part represented as a severe judge. Thus in the picture of Rubens in Lyons, Christ is depicted with the thunder-bolt, while Mary, with St. Dominic and St. Francis, is making supplications at his feet: see *Quandt*, Reise ins mittägliche Frankreich, Leipz. 1846, p. 99. [See Mrs. *Jameson's* Legends of the Madonna, 1852.]

[2] In the Greek Church it was, in the first instance, in reference to the adoration of images, that this distinction was made by the second synod of Nice (in *Mansi* Concil. T. xiii. Col. 377), as well as by *Theodore Studita*, Ep. 167, App. 521. The *λατρεία* is due to none but the triune God, the *τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις* we owe also to images.—In the Latin Church, *Peter Lombard*, Sent. Lib. iii. Dict. 9, A., ascribed the *Latria* to God alone. He further asserted, that there are two species of *Dulia*, the one of which belongs to every creature, while the other is due *only to the human nature of Christ*. *Thomas Aquinas* added (Lib. ii. P. i. Qu. 103, Art. 4) the *Hyperdulia*, which he ascribed to none but Mary. Compare the passages quoted by *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, pp. 182, 183.

[3] This was done *e. g.* by Hus, in his treatise De Mysterio Antichristi, c. 23. See *Schröckh*, xxxiv. pp. 614, 615.

The adoration of saints was connected with *the adoration of images*, and *the worship of images*. The consideration of the external history of the controversy respecting images belongs to the province of ecclesiastical history. The worship of images was defended upon doctrinal grounds by *John Damascenus*, Orationes II. pro Imaginibus. Opp. T. i. p. 305, ss.—The Synod of Constantinople (A. D. 754) decided against the superstitious adoration of images, the second Synod of Nice (A. D. 787) pronounced in favor of it. A distinction was made between the *λατρεία*, which is due to God alone, and the *προσκύνησις τιμητικὴ* (*ἀσπασμός*), which could be paid as well to the images or pictures of saints, as to the sign of the cross and the Holy Gospels.—An intermediate view was at first entertained in the Western Church (imagines non ad adorandum, sed ad memoriam rerum gestarum et parietum venustatem habere permittimus), *e. g.* by the Emperor Charlemagne in the treatise De impio Imaginum Cultu, Lib. iv. (written about the year 790), and the Synod of Frankfort (A. D. 794); the doctrine of the Synod of Nice was defended by Pope Hadrian (he composed a refutation of the books of Charlemagne; in *Mansi* T. xiii. Col. 759, ss.). Theodulph of Orleans.—*Thomas Aquinas* afterwards asserted (Summ. P. iii. Qu. 25, Art. 3), in reference to the cross of Christ: Cum ergo Christus adoretur adoratione latriæ, consequens est, quod ejus imago sit adoratione latriæ adoranda (here then we have a specimen of real idolatry?). Comp. Art. 4, and *John Damascenus* De Fide Orthod. Lib. iv. c. 11.

§ 189.

THE SACRAMENTS.

"*The doctrine of the Sacraments is the principal point in which the scholastics were productive in the formal aspect, as well as the material.*"[1] Not only was the attempt made by several theologians, such as *Hugo of St. Victor*,[2] *Peter Lombard*,[3] and others, to establish a more precise definition of the term "sacrament," upon the basis laid down by Augustine; but, with regard to the number of sacraments, the sacred number seven was determined upon especially

through the influence of Peter Lombard.[4] In reference to the latter point, however, nothing had been decided previous to the time of *Bonaventura* and *Thomas Aquinas*.[5] But after the number had once been determined, it was a comparatively easy task for theologians, so acute as the scholastics, to find out some profound reasons for it.[6] As, moreover, the Greek church, from the ninth century, manifested a disposition to increase the number of the sacraments,[7] when attempts were made at that time to unite the two churches, the Western computation was confirmed by the Council of Florence.[8] Only *Wycliffe*, the Waldenses, and the more rigid among the Husites, either returned to the primitive number two, or dissented more or less from the seven of the Catholic church, and from its idea of the sacrament.[9]

[1] *Ullmann*, Wessel, pp. 321, 322.

[2] *Hugo of St. Victor* was not satisfied with the definition of Augustine: sacramentum est, sacræ rei signum (comp. vol. i. § 136), and called it a mere nominal definition. Letters and pictures, added he, might equally be signs of sacred things. His own definition is given Lib. i. P. ix. c. 2: Sacramentum est corporale vel materiale elementum foris sensibiliter propositum, ex similitudine repræsentans, ex institutione significans, et ex sanctificatione continens, aliquam invisibilem et spiritalem gratiam. The definition given in Summ. Tr. ii. c. 1, is shorter: sacramentum est visibilis forma invisibilis gratiæ in eo collatæ. Comp. De Sacr. Lib. ii. P. vi. c. 3; *Liebner*, p. 426. [*Hugo* also uses sacramentum in a wider sense—*e. g.*, c. 9, De Sacramento Fidei et Virtute: Sacramentum enim fidei vel ipsa fides intelligitur, quæ sacramentum est, vel sacramenta fidei intelliguntur, quæ cum fide percipienda sunt et ad sanctificationem fidelium præparata sunt.]

[3] Sent. L. iv. Dist. 13: Sacramentum enim proprie dicitur, quod ita signum est gratiæ dei et invisibilis gratiæ forma, ut ipsius imaginem gerat et causa existat. The same can not be said with regard to all signs...(omne sacramentum est signum, sed non e converso). Comp. *Bonaventura*, Breviloqu. vi. c. 1, ss.

[4] As late as the present period the opinions of the theologians on this point were for a considerable time divided. *Rabanus Maurus* and *Paschasius Radbert* acknowledged only four sacraments, or, more properly speaking, only the two sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper; but in connection with baptism they mentioned the Chrisma (confirmation), and divided the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to its two elements, the body and the blood of Christ. *Rabanus* de Inst. Cler. i. 24: Sunt autem sacramenta Baptismus et Chrisma, Corpus et Sanguis, quæ ob id sacramenta dicuntur, quia sub tegumento corporalium rerum virtus divina secretius salutem eorundem sacramentorum operatur, unde et a secretis virtutibus vel sacris *sacramenta* dicuntur. Comp. *Paschasius* de Corp. et Sang. Domini c. 3.—*Berengar* of Tours expressed himself in similar terms (de S. Cœna. Berolini, 1834, p. 153): Duo sunt enim præcipue ecclesiæ sacramenta sibi assentanea, sibi comparabilia, regenerationis fidelium et refectionis (baptism and the Lord's Supper).—*Gottfried*, abbot of Vendôme, about 1120,

calls the ring and staff with which the bishops were instituted, *sacramenta ecclesiæ*.—*Bernard of Clairval* spoke of the washing of the feet as a sacrament (Sermo in Cœnam Domini, § 4, quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 188.)—*Hugo of St. Victor* (Lib. i. P. viii. c. 7), assumed three classes of sacraments: 1. Those sacraments upon which salvation is supremely founded, and by the participation of which the highest blessings are imparted (baptism and the Lord's Supper, together with confirmation, which is placed, P. vii., between the two others.) 2. Those sacraments which promote sanctification, though they are not necessary to salvation, inasmuch as, by their use, the right sentiments of Christians are kept in practice, and a higher degree of grace may be obtained: such are the use of holy water, the sprinkling with ashes, etc. 3. Those sacraments which seem to be instituted only in order to serve as a kind of preparation for, and sanctification of, the other sacraments, such as holy orders, the consecration of the robes of the clergy, and others.—Besides the said three sacraments of the first class, he made particular mention of the sacraments of matrimony (Lib. ii. P. ix.), of penance (P. xiv.), and of extreme unction (P. xv.); "*but he did not state, in reference to any of these sacraments, as he did with regard to baptism and the Lord's Supper, that it was necessary to number it among the sacraments of the first class. It is therefore uncertain whether he has not put some of them among those of the second class.*" *Liebner*, p. 429. *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, pp. 188, 189.—[*Hugo* sums up thus: Prima ergo ad salutem, secunda ad exercitationem, tertia ad præparationem constituta sunt. Cap. 7.] *Peter Damiani* mentioned as many as twelve sacraments (Opp. T. ii. p. 167–169.)—Whether *Otto Bishop of Bamberg* (who lived between the years 1139 and 1189, and who, according to the Vita Othonis, in *Canisius* Lectt. Antiqu., ed. *Basnage*. T. iii. P. ii. p. 62) introduced the seven sacraments among the Pomeranians whom he had converted to Christianity, is a point which remains to be investigated (see *Engelhardt*, Dogmengeschichte ii. p. 196. *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, pp. 189, 190.) [*Gieseler*, Church History, doubts the tradition about Otto of Bamberg; the Discourse in which it is found, he considers not to be genuine.]—The views of *Peter Lombard* on the subject in question were more decided: see Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 2, A: Jam ad sacramenta novæ legis accedamus, quæ sunt Baptismus, Confirmatio, Panis benedictio, *i. e.*, Eucharistia, Pœnitentia, Unctio extrema, Ordo, Conjugium. Quorum alia remedium contra peccatum præbent, et gratiam adjutricem conferunt, ut Baptismus; alia in remedium tantum sunt, ut Conjugium; alia gratia et virtute nos fulciunt, ut Eucharistia et Ordo.

[b] Thus *Alanus ab Insulis*, Lib. iv. (quoted by *Pez*, p. 497) enumerated the following sacraments: Baptismus, Eucharistia, Matrimonium, Pœnitentia, Dedicatio basilicarum, Chrismatis et Olei inunctio, and assigned them their place as means of grace between the *prædicatio* and the *ecclesia*. He spoke only of a plurality of sacraments, but did not state the exact number seven. Comp. iii. 6. *Alexander Hales*, though he adopted the number seven, admitted that baptism and the Lord's Supper alone were instituted by our Lord himself, and that the other sacraments had been appointed by his

apostles, and the ministers of the church. (Summa P. iv. Qu. 8, Membr. 2, Art. 1, quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, pp. 196, 197.)

[6] According to *Thomas Aquinas*, P. iii. Qu. 65. Art. 1. the first five sacraments serve—ad spiritualem uniuscujusque hominis in se ipso perfectionem, but the last two, ad totius ecclesiæ regimen multiplicationemque. He then continues: Per Baptismum spiritualiter renascimur, per Confirmationem augemur in gratia et roboramur in fide; renati autem et roborati nutrimur divina Eucharistiæ alimonia. Quod si per peccatum ægritudinem incurrimus animæ, per Pœnitentiam spiritualiter sanamur; spiritualiter etiam et corporaliter, prout animæ expedit, per extremam Unctionem. Per Ordinem vero ecclesia gubernatur et multiplicatur spiritualiter, per Matrimonium corporaliter augetur.—Thomas, however, agreed with other theologians, Summ. P. iii. Qu. 62. Art. 5. in regarding baptism and the Lord's Supper as potissima sacramenta.—*Bonaventura* brought (Brevil. vi. Cont. iii. sect. 47. c. 3.) the seven sacraments into connection with the seven diseases of man. Original sin is counteracted by baptism, mortal sin by penance, venial sin by extreme unction; ignorance is cured by ordination, malice by the Lord's Supper, infirmity by confirmation, evil concupiscence by matrimony).* He also made a corresponding connection between the sacraments and the seven cardinal virtues: baptism leads to faith, confirmation to hope, the Lord's Supper to love, penance to righteousness, extreme unction to perseverance, ordination to wisdom, matrimony to moderation (for further particulars see, ibidem.)—Comp. also *Berthold's* Sermons edited by *Kling*, p. 439, ss. The "seven sacred things" are, in his opinion, a remedy prepared by Jesus, divided into seven parts, etc.† See also *Raimund of Sabunde*, Tit. 282, in Matzke, p. 91. [Et ideo Christus ordinavit ad significandum et repræsentandum omnia ista quæ sunt invisibilia et debent fieri occulte in anima, ut scilicet exterius in corpore fieret ablutio et lavacrum per aquam elementalem cum verbis expresse significantibus ablutionem et lavacrum. Et ideo ista ablutio, quæ fit in aqua eo modo quo Christus ordinavit, vocatur sacramentum seu signum regenerationis et renovationis, quia hoc est regenerare hominem et innovare, quia anima recipit novum esse spirituale. Et ideo in isto sacramento recipit homo nomen novum, quia vocatur Christianus, etc.]

[7] *John Damascenus* mentioned (De Fide Orthod. iv. 13) the two mysteries of baptism and the Lord's Supper, the former in reference to the birth of man, the latter in reference to the support of his new life; these two mysteries were again subdivided by him—viz, baptism into water and Spirit (Chrisma), and the Lord's Supper into bread and wine.—*Theodore Studita* taught (lib. ii. Ep. 165, Opp. p. 517) six sacraments (after the example of Pseudo-Dionysius, see vol. i. § 136, Note 3)—viz. 1. Baptism; 2. The Lord's Supper (*σύναξις, κοινωνία*); 3. The consecration of the holy oil (*τελετὴ μύρου*); 4. The ordination of priests (*ἱερατικαὶ τελειώσεις*); 5. The monastic state (*μοναχικὴ τελείωσις*); and 6. The rites performed for the dead

* "*Thus the poor laity have no sacrament for ignorance, nor have the poor clergy a sacrament to counteract lusts.*" *Schleiermacher*, Kirchengesch. p. 514.

† '*The Sacraments were also referred by some to the seven kinds of animal sacrifices in the Old Testament and the sprinkling of their blood.*" *Gieseler*, Dogmengesch. 531.

(περὶ τῶν ἱερῶς κεκοιμημένων). See *Schröckh*, Kirchengeschichte, xxii. pp. 127, 128.

[8] *Mansi* Conc. T. xxxi. Col. 1054 ss. The decisions of this Synod had also binding force for the united Armenians.

[9] *Wycliffe* made mention of the ecclesiastical number, Lib. iv. c. 1., but in the subsequent chapters critically examined each sacrament separately. Comp. § 190, note 10. Christ was to him "the Sacrament of Sacraments:" *Böhringer*, 329.—The confession of faith adopted by the Waldenses is given by *Legér*, Histoire Générale des églises évangéliques de Piémont, Leiden, 1669, p. 95, quoted by *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. xxix. p. 548. That of the Husites, A. D. 1443, will be found in *Lenfant*, Histoire de la Guerre des Husites, vol. ii. p. 132, ss. *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. xxxiv. p. 718, ss. Hus himself adopted the doctrine of seven sacraments, though with certain modifications: see *Münscher*, edit. by Von Cölln, p. 201.

§ 190.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Many discussions took place among the scholastics as to the antiquity of the sacraments,[1] their necessity, design, and significance, as well as respecting their specific virtue and effects.[2] In the spirit of the better class of the mystics, *Hugo of St. Victor* traced the design of the sacraments to the inward religious wants of man.[3] But *Thomas Aquinas* especially endeavored, with a great show of learning, both to define the idea of sacrament still more precisely, and to enlighten himself, as well as others, concerning its effects.[4] In consequence of the death of Jesus, the sacraments instituted in the New Testament have obtained what is called the *virtus instrumentalis*, or *effectiva*, which those of the Old Testament did not possess.[5] Therefore, by partaking of the sacraments, man acquires a certain *character*, which in the case of some sacraments, such as baptism, confirmation and the ordination of priests, is *character indelebilis*, and, consequently, renders impossible the repetition of such sacraments.[6] The effects produced by the sacraments arise, not only *ex opere operantis*, but also *ex opere operato*.[7] Accordingly, they neither depend upon the external or internal worth of him who administers the sacrament, nor upon his faith and moral character, but upon his intention to administer the sacrament as such. This intention must at least be *habitual;* but it is not absolutely necessary that it should be *actual*.[8]—In opposition to the doctrine of Thomas, which received the sanction of the Catholic Church, *Duns Scotus* denied that the effective power of grace was contained in the sacraments themselves.[9] The forerunners of the Reformation, *e. g. Wessel* and *Wycliffe*, combated still

more decidedly the doctrine, that the effects of the sacrament are produced *ex opere operato*, while they manifested the highest reverence for the sacraments themselves as divine institutions.[10] Thus they preserved the medium between that superstitious, and merely external view, by which the sacrament was changed, as it were, into a charm, and the fanatical and subjective theory adopted by the pantheistic sects, who proudly idealized and rejected all visible pledges and seals of supernatural blessings.[11]

[1] On the question, in what sense the Old Testament may be said to have had its sacraments? see *Peter Lombard*, Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 1, E..... Veteris Testamenti sacramenta promittebant tantum et significabant, hæc autem (novi testamenti) *dant* salutem (comp. the opinions of Augustine, ibidem.) Inasmuch as the sacraments were made necessary in consequence of sin, but God had instituted *matrimony* in Paradise, *this* sacrament was considered to be the earliest, belonging even to the state of innocence. See *Cramer*, vii. p. 103. Comp. *Thomas Aquinas* (in notes 4 and 5).

[2] "*The common tradition of the Church taught only the notion of a magical efficacy of the sacraments, and thus assigned too great an influence to the mere external and unspiritual form. On the contrary, the scholastics clearly perceived, that justification and sanctification are something essentially free, internal, and spiritual, and depend upon faith. These two notions being contradictory to each other, it became necessary to reconcile them, which was for the most part done by ingenious reasonings;*" *Liebner*, Hugo von St. Victor, p. 430.

[3] According to *Hugo of St. Victor*, the design of the sacraments is threefold: Propter humiliationem (we must submit to the visible, in order to attain *by it*, to the invisible); 2. Propter eruditionem (the visible leads to the invisible. Though a sick person may not see the medicine he is to take, he sees the bottle, which gives him an intimation of the healing power it contains, and inspires him with confidence and hope); 3. Propter exercitationem (the inner and spiritual life of man is strengthened thereby). The three persons of the Trinity take an active part in the administration of the sacraments. The Father (as the Creator) creates the elements; the Son (as the Redeemer, God-man) institutes them; and the Holy Ghost sanctifies them (through grace). Man, as the instrument of God, distributes them. God is the physician, man is the diseased person, the priest is the servant or the messenger of God, the *grace* of God (not the sacrament) is the medicine, and the sacrament is the vessel in which it is contained.—God could have saved man *without* sacraments, if he had chosen; but since he has been pleased to institute them, it is the duty of man to submit to his arrangement; nevertheless, God can still save without sacraments. If either time or place prevent one from receiving the sacraments, the res (virtus) sacramenti is sufficient; for the thing itself is of more importance than the sign, faith is more than water, etc.; De Sacram. Lib. i. P. ix., c. 3–5. *Liebner*, p. 430, ss.

[4] *Thomas Aquinas* Summ. P. iii., Qu. 60–65. (Extracts from it are given by *Münscher*, edit. by Von Cölln, p. 192, ss.) [Qu. 60, Art. 2. Sacramen

tum est signum rei sacræ, inquantum est *sanctificans* homines. Art. 3. In qua sanctificatione tria possunt considerari: videlicet, ipsa *causa* sanctificationis nostræ, quæ est passio Christi: et forma nostræ sanctificationis, quæ consistit in gratia et virtutibus; et ultimus *finis* sanctificationis nostræ, quæ est vita æterna. Et hæc omnia per sacramenta significantur.—Qu. 61, Art. 1: they are necessary to human salvation in a threefold way: 1. Because man is led by sensible objects. 2. By sin, he is under the sway of what is corporeal. 3. Human action is chiefly through and about corporeal matters, etc.]

[5] Qu. 62., Art. 1: Necesse est dicere sacramenta novæ legis per aliquem modum gratiam causare.....Et dicendum est, quod duplex est causa agens, *principalis* et *instrumentalis*. *Principalis* quidem operatur per virtutem suæ formæ, cui assimilatur effectus, sicut ignis suo calore calefacit. Et hoc modo nihil potest causare gratiam nisi Deus, quia gratia nihil est aliud, quam quædam participata similitudo divinæ naturæ. Causa vero *instrumentalis* non agit per virtutem suæ formæ, sed solum per motum, quo movetur a principali agente. Unde effectus non assimilatur instrumento, sed principali agenti. Et hoc modo sacramenta novæ legis gratiam causant.—Art. 5: Unde manifestum est, quod sacramenta ecclesiæ specialiter habent virtutem ex passione Christi, cujus virtus quodammodo nobis copulatur per susceptionem sacramentorum.—Art. 6: Per fidem passionis Christi justificabantur antiqui patres, sicut et nos. Sacramenta autem veteris legis erant quædam illius fidei protestationes, inquantum significabant passionem Christi et effectus ejus. Sic ergo patet, quod sacramenta veteris legis non habebant in se aliquam virtutem, qua operarentur ad conferendam gratiam justificantem; sed solum significabant fidem per quam justificabantur.*

[6] *Innocent III.* in Decret. Greg. IX. L. iii. T. 42, c. 3: Et is, qui ficte ad baptismum accedit, *characterem* suscipit christianitatis impressum. *Thomas*, P. iii. Qu. 63, Art. 2: Sacramenta novæ legis *characterem* imprimunt.—The Concilium Florentinum, held under Pope Eugen IV., laid down the following canon (in *Mansi* T. xxxi. Col. 1054, ss.): Inter hæc Sacramenta tria sunt, Baptismus, Confirmatio et Ordo, quæ characterem, *i. e.* spirituale quoddam signum a cæteris distinctivum imprimunt in anima indelebile. *Unde in eadem persona non reiterantur.* Reliqua vero quatuor characterem non imprimunt et reiterationem admittunt. (Nevertheless a difference of opinion respecting the repetition of extreme unction, took place on occasion of the death of Pope Pius II. Concerning the discussion which arose between the dying Pope and Laurentius Roverella, bishop of Ferrara, see *Platina* in Vita Pii II. Compare below, § 199, note 3.)

[7] The distinction between these two terms was best defined by *Gabriel Biel*, in Sent. Lib. iv., Dist. 1, Qu. 3. *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 199):

* "*The notion that the sacraments of the Old Testament had only figured the divine grace but not communicated it, was rejected by John Bonaventura and Scotus, after the opposite doctrine had previously been propounded by the Venerable Bede; it was, however, confirmed by Pope Eugen IV. at the Council of Florence.*" *Münscher*, edit. by Von Cölln, p. 187 (the proofs are given ibid. pp. 198, 199). The doctrine was then established, that the sacraments of the Old Testament produced effects *ex opere operantis*, those of the New Testament *ex opere operato*. Comp. *Engelhardt*, Dogmengeschichte, pp. 197, 198, note.

Sacramentum dicitur conferre gratiam ex opere operato, ita quod ex eo ipso, quod opus illud, puta sacramentum, exhibetur, nisi impediat obex peccati mortalis, gratia confertur utentibus, sic quod præter exhibitionem signi foris exhibiti non requiritur bonus motus interior in suscipiente. Ex opere operante vero dicuntur Sacramenta conferre gratiam per modum *meriti*, quod scilicet sacramentum foris exhibitum non sufficit ad gratiæ collationem, sed ultra hoc requiritur bonus motus seu devotio interior in suscipiente, secundum cujus intentionem confertur gratia, tanquam meriti condigni vel congrui, præcise, et non major propter exhibitionem sacramenti. (This latter view was also that of Scotus.)

[8] *Thomas*, l. c. Qu. 64, Art. 5 :....Ministri ecclesiæ possunt sacramenta conferre, etiamsi sint mali.—Art. 9 : Sicut non requiritur ad perfectionem sacramenti, quod minister sit in charitate, sed possunt etiam peccatores sacramenta conferre, ita non requiritur ad perfectionem sacramenti fides ejus, sed infidelis potest verum sacramentum præbere, dummodo cætera adsint, quæ sunt de necessitate sacramenti. Concerning the *intentio*, compare ibidem and Art. 10. *Münscher*, edit. by Von Cölln, p. 196. *Cramer*, vii. pp. 712, 713. [*Aquinas* opposed the view—quod requiritur *mentalis intentio* in ministro, quæ si desit, non perficitur sacramentum; and maintained, quod minister sacramenti agit in persona totius ecclesiæ cujus est minister. In verbis autem quæ profert exprimitur *intentio ecclesiæ ;* quæ *sufficit ad perfectionem sacramenti*, nisi contrarium externis exprimatur ex parte ministri, vel recipientis sacramentum. Comp. also Art. 10.]

[9] Compare note 7.

[10] *Wycliffe* criticised the doctrine of the sacraments very acutely. Trialogus Lib. iv. c. l. ss. In his opinion, a thousand other things (in their quality of rerum sacrarum signa) might be called sacraments, with quite as much propriety as the seven sacraments....Multa dicta in ista materia habent nimis debile fundamentum, et propter aggregationem ac institutionem in terminis difficile est loquentibus habere viam impugnabilem veritatis....Non enim video, quin quælibet creatura sensibilis sit realiter sacramentum, quia signum a Deo institutum ut rem sacram insensibilem significet, cujusmodi sunt creator et creatio et gratia creatoris. Comp. c. 25, where he designated the ceremonies which had been added to the sacraments, inventions of Antichrist, by which he had imposed a heavy burden upon the Church.—*Wessel* expressed himself in milder terms on this point; he did not altogether disapprove of certain external additions (Chrisma), since, out of reverence the Church has surrounded the sacraments with greater pomp; but, concerning their effects, he opposed the doctrine which would represent them as being produced ex opere operato, and he made salvation depend on the disposition of him who receives the sacrament; De Commun. Sanct., p. 817. *Ullmann*, pp. 322, 333.

[11] *Mosheim*, l. c. p. 257 : Dicunt, se credere, quod quidlibet Laicus bonus potest conficere corpus Christi, sicut sacerdos peccator. Item, quod sacerdos, postquam exuit se sacris vestibus, est sicut saccus evacuatus frumento. Item, quod corpus Christi æqualiter est in quolibet pane, sicut in pane sacramentali. Item, quod confiteri sacerdoti non est necessarium ad salutem. Item, quod corpus Christi vel sacramentum Eucharistiæ sumere per Laicum, tan-

tum valet pro liberatione animæ defuncti, sicut celebratio Missæ a sacerdote. Item, quod omnis concubitus matrimonialis præter illum, in quo speratur bonum prolis, sit peccatum.—Comp. *Berthold's* Sermons, edited by *Kling*, pp. 308, 309.

§ 191.

BAPTISM.

The scholastics exhibited more originality in their discussions on the Lord's Supper, than in their inquiries into the doctrine of Baptism, where they confined themselves rather to particular points. In adherence to the allegorical system of Cyprian, they adopted the mystical interpretation of the water, as the liquid element, but exercised their ingenuity and fondness for subtile distinctions in pedantic definitions concerning the fluids to be used at the performance of the rite of baptism.[1] The baptism of blood was as well known during the present period as in preceding ages, with this difference only, that it was performed by those who inflicted tortures upon themselves (Flagellantes) instead of by martyrs.[2] The baptism of water could be administered by none but priests, except in cases of necessity.[3] The doctrine of infant baptism had long been regarded by the Church as a settled point; *Peter of Bruis*, however, and some mystical sects, spoke of it in a slighting way.[4] As infants, the subjects of baptism could not enter into any engagement themselves; an engagement was made for them by their godfathers and godmothers, according to the principle of Augustine: credit in altero, qui peccavit in altero.[5]—Infant baptism was supposed to remove orignal sin, but it did not take away the concupiscentia (lex fomitis), though it lessened it by means of the grace imparted in baptism.[6] In the case of grown up persons who are baptised, baptism not only effects the pardon of sins formerly committed, but it also imparts, according to *Peter Lombard*, assisting grace to perform virtuous actions.[7]—The assertion of *Thomas Aquinas*, that children also obtained that grace,[8] was confirmed by Pope Clement V. at the Synod of Vienne (A. D. 1311.)[9]

[1] Compare *Cramer*, vii. p. 715. ss. *Peter Lombard* taught, Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 3, G: non in alio liquore potest consecrari baptismus nisi in aqua; others, however, thought that the rite of baptism might also be performed with air, sand, or soil. (*Schmid, J. A.*, de Baptismo per Arenam. Helmst. 1697. 4.) Various opinions obtained concerning the question, whether beer, broth, fish-sauce, mead or honey-water, lye or rose-water, might be used instead of pure water. See *Meiners* and *Spittlers* Neues Göttingen. historisches Magazin, Vol. iii. part 2, 1793, 8, (reprinted from Holderi dubitatibus circa Baptismum): *Augusti*, theologische Blätter, Vol. i. p. 170, ss.,

and his Archæologie vii. p. 206, ss. The scholastics carried their absurdities so far, as to start the question: Quid faciendum, si puer urinaret (stercorizaret) in fontem? A distinction was also made between aqua artificialis, naturalis, and usualis.—Many other useless and unprofitable contentions took place about the baptismal formulas; see *Holder*, l. c.—*Sprinkling* also (instead of dipping) gave rise to many discussions. *Thomas Aquinas*, preferred the more ancient custom (Summa P. iii. Qu. 66, Art. 6), because immersion reminded Christians of the *burial* of Christ: but he did not think it absolutely necessary. From the thirteenth century, sprinkling came into more general use in the West. The Greek Church, however, and the Church of Milan, still retained the practice of immersion; see *Augusti*, Archæologie vii. p. 229, ss.*—On the question whether it was necessary to dip once, or thrice, see Holder, l. c. (he has collected many more instances of the ingenuity and acuteness of the casuists in reference to all possible difficulties.)

[2] *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 66, Art. 11.....præter baptismum aquæ potest aliquis consequi sacramenti effectum ex passione Christi, inquantam quis ei conformatur pro Christo patiendo.—Concerning the Flagellantes, see *Förstemann*, die christlichen Geisslergesellschaften, Halle, 1828.

[3] *Peter Lombard*, Sent. iv. Dist. 6, A (after Isidore of Spain): Constat baptismum solis sacerdotibus esse traditum, ejusque ministerium nec ipsis diaconis implere est licitum absque episcopo vel presbytero, nisi his procul absentibus, ultima languoris cogat necessitas: quod etiam laïcis fidelibus permittitur.—Compare Gratian. in Decret. de Consecrat. Dist. 4, c. 19.—*Thomas Aquinas*, Summ. P. iii. Qu. 67, Art. 1–6. (The further definitions belong to the province of canon law.)

[4] Comp. Petr. Ven. Cluniacensis adv. Petrobrusianos, in Bibl. PP. Max. Lugd. T. xxii. p. 1033.—The Paulicians, Bogomiles, Cathari, etc., opposed infant baptism; several of these sects (*e. g.*, the Cathari) rejected baptism by water altogether. Comp. *Moneta*, advers. Catharos et Waldenses, Lib. v. c. i., p. 277, ss. *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, pp. 209, 210.

[5] Comp. Vol. i. § 137, note 6, p. 390, *Peter Lombard*, Sent. L. iv. Dist. 6, G. *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 68, Art. 9: Regeneratio spiritualis, quæ fit per baptismum, est quodammodo similis nativitati carnali, quantum ad hoc, quod, sicut pueri in maternis uteris constituti non per se ipsos nutrimentum accipiunt, sed ex nutrimento matris sustentantur, ita etiam pueri nondum habentes usum rationis, quasi in utero matris ecclesiæ constituti, non per se ipsos, sed per actum ecclesiæ salutem suscipiunt.—The regulations concerning the ecclesiastical relationship in which the godfathers and godmothers stand to each other, belong to the canon law. Comp. *Peter Lomb.* L. iv. Dist. 42. *Thomas Aquinas*, P. iii. in Supplem. Qu. 56, Art. 3.—Decretalia Greg. IX. L. iv. T. 11. Sexti Decretal. L. iv. T. 3.

[6] *Lombard*, L. ii. Dist. 32, A. (in accordance with Augustine): Licet remaneat concupiscentia post baptismum, non tamen dominatur et regnat sicut ante: imo per gratiam baptismi mitigatur et minuitur, ut post dominari

* Various regulations concerning the right performance of baptism may also be found in *Berthold's* Sermons, pp 442, 443. Thus it is there said: "Young people ought not to baptize children for fun or mockery; nor ought foolish people to push a Jew into the water contrary to his wishes. Such doings are not valid."

non valeat, nisi quis reddat vires hosti eundo post concupiscentias. Nec post baptismum remanet ad reatum, quia non imputatur in peccatum, sed tantum pœna peccati est; ante baptismum vero pœna est et culpa. Compare what follows. *Thomas Aquinas*, Summ. P. ii. Qu. 81, Art. 3: Peccatum originale per baptismum aufertur *reatu*, inquantum anima recuperat gratiam quantum ad mentem: remanet tamen peccatum originale *actu*, quantum ad *fomitem*, qui est inordinatio partium inferiorum animæ et ipsius corporis. Comp. P. iii. Qu. 27, Art. 3.

[7] *Lombard* Lib. iv. Dist. 4, II: De adultis enim, qui digne recipiunt sacramentum, non ambigitur, quin gratiam operantem et cooperantem percep:rint. . . . . De parvulis vero, qui nondum ratione utuntur, quæstio est, an in baptismo receperint gratiam, qua ad majorem venientes ætatem possint velle et operari bonum. Videtur quod non receperint: quia gratia illa charitas est et fides, quæ voluntatem præparat et adjuvat. Sed quis duxerit eos accepisse fidem et charitatem? Si vero gratiam non receperint, qua bene operari possint cum fuerint adulti, non ergo sufficit eis in hoc statu gratia in baptismo data, nec per illam possunt modo boni esse, nisi alia addatur: quæ si non additur, non est ex eorum culpa, quia justificati [*al.* non] sunt a peccato. Quidam putant gratiam operantem et cooperantem cunctis parvulis in baptismo dari in munere, non in usu, ut, cum ad majorem venerint ætatem, ex munere sortiantur usum, nisi per liberum arbitrium usum muneris extinguant peccando: et ita ex culpa eorum est, non ex defectu gratiæ, quod mali fiunt.

[8] *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 69, Art. 6: Quia pueri, sicut et adulti, in baptismo efficiuntur membra Christi, unde necesse est, quod a capite recipiant influxum gratiæ et virtutis.

[9] In *Mansi*, Tom. xxv. Col. 411, *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 203. [*Mansi*, Col. 411: Baptisma unicum....celebratum in aqua, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, credimus esse tam adultis quam parvulis communiter perfectum remedium ad salutem. Verum quantum ad effectum cum theologi varias opiniones habeant; videlicet dicentibus quibusdam, parvulis culpam remitti, sed gratiam non conferri; aliis e contra assentibus quod et culpa eisdem in baptismo remittitur, et virtutes ac informans gratia infunduntur quoad *habitum*, etsi non pro illo tempore quoad *usum:* nos attendentes generalem efficaciam mortis Christi, quæ per baptisma applicatur pariter omnibus baptizatis, opinionem secundam, quæ dicit tam parvulis quam adultis conferri in baptismo, gratiam informantem et virtutes, tanquam probabiliorem et dictis Sanctorum et doctorum modernorum theologiæ magis consonam et concordem, sacro approbante Concilio, duximus eligendam.]

The repetition of the rite of baptism was not in accordance with the nature of that sacrament. But theologians differed in their opinions respecting the question, whether those who are prevented by circumstances from being baptised, may be saved? In opposition to earlier divines (such as *Rabanus Maurus*), later theologians, *e. g. Bernard of Clairval*, *Peter Lombard*, and *Thomas Aquinas*, maintained, that in such cases the *will* alone was sufficient. Compare the passages quoted by *Munscher*, edit. by von Cölln, pp. 205, 206. [*Aquinas*, Qu. 68, Art. 2: Alio modo potest sacramentum baptismi alicui deesse *re, sed non voto:* sicut cum aliquis baptizari desiderat, sed aliquo casu prævenitur morte, antequam baptismum suscipiat. *Et talis sine baptismo actuali salutem consequi potest propter desiderium baptismi*, quod procedit ex fide per dilectionem operante, per quam Deus interius hominem sanctificat, cujus potentia sacramentis visibilibus non alligatur.]

§ 192.

CONFIRMATION.

Klee, Dogmengeschichte, ii. p. 160–170. *J. F. Bachmann*, Geschichte der Einführung der Confirmation innerhalb d. Evangel. Kirche. Berlin, 1852. [*Jo. Dallæus*, de duabus Latinorum ex Unctione Sacramentis, Confirmatione et extrema Unctione, Genev., 1669. *Ibid.* De Cultibus religios. Latinorum, L. ix., 1671. In reply, *Natal. Alexander*, Hist. Eccles. Sæc. II. Diss. x. *N. Wiseman*, Lectures on the Offices and Ceremonies, etc. *H. Hepwood*, the Order and History of Confirmation, 2d ed., 1850. Church Review (New Haven), Difference of Protest. Episc. and Rom. Cath. View of Confirmation, April, 1852. *T. Smyth*, the Rite of Confirmation, 1845.]

Confirmation (χρῖσμα, confirmatio) originally connected with baptism, was, in the course of time, separated from it, as a particular rite, and then came to be viewed as a sacrament, which only the bishop could administer.[1] As the first motion to spiritual life is the effect of baptism, so its growth is promoted by the rite of confirmation. Its characteristic is invigoration ;[2] and so, those who are made members of this spiritual knighthood were smitten on the cheek.[3] Moreover baptism must precede confirmation.[4] Nor ought the latter rite to be performed without godfathers and godmothers.[5] All these regulations were confirmed by Pope Eugen IV.[6] But *Wycliffe* and *Hus* declared confirmation to be an abuse.[7]

[1] Compare *Augusti*, Archæologie, vii. p. 401, ss. On the origin of this sacrament, and its reference to a Council of Meaux (Concilium Meldense), as alleged by Alexander of Hales, see *Giesceler*, Dogmengesch. 527. [Alexander got this notion from the Decretum Gratiani, where a statement about Confirmation is headed—Ex Concil. Meldens. But the passage is from a Paris Council, A. D. 829. But Alexander, though wrong, seems unconsciously to imply, that a sacrament might be directly instituted by the church; which *Aquinas* denies, saying, that the sacraments must be appointed or promised by Christ.]

[2] *Melchiades* in Epist. ad Hisp. Episcopos (in *Peter Lombard*, Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 7); *Thomas Aquinas*, Art. 6, and 7 (quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, pp. 211, 212). [*Melchiades* (in Pseudo-Isidor.) says: Sp. S. in *fonte* plenitudinem tribuit ad *innocentiam:* in *confirmatione augmentum* præstat ad *gratiam*. Et quia in hoc mundo tota ætate victoris inter invisibiles hostes et pericula gradiendum est: in baptismo regeneramur ad vitam, post baptismum confirmamur ad pugnam.... *Aquinas*, Art. 6: Character confirmationis *ex necessitate præsupponit characterem baptismalem:* ita scilicet quod, si aliquis *non baptizatus* confirmaretur, nihil reciperet, sed oporteret *iterato* ipsum *confirmari* post baptismum (against the Catharists.)] *Bonaventura* Brevil. P. vi. c. 8, quoted by *Klee*, Dogmengeschichte, ii. p. 165. [*Bonaventura* says: Primo ergo, quoniam confessio hæc debet esse integra, et integritas confessionis non est, nisi quis confiteatur Christum verum hominem pro hominibus crucifixum, eundemque verum Dei filium in-

carnatum in Trinitate Patri et Spiritui Sancto per omnia æqualem, hinc est, quod in forma vocali non tantum fit expressio actus confirmandi, verum etiam ipsius signi crucis, et nominis beatissimæ Trinitatis.—As it should, secondly, be placid and pleasing to God, oil of olives and balsam, etc., are used. Postremo, quia talis confessio debet esse intrepida, ut nec pudore, nec timore dimittat quis dicere veritatem, et tempore persecutionis ignominiosam mortem Christi in cruce confiteri publice formidat quis et erubescit....et hujus modi timor et pudor potissime apparet in fronte, ideo ad omnem verecundiam et formidinem propulsandam et manus potestativa imponitur, quæ confirmet et crux fronti imprimitur. *Klee*, ubi supra, pp. 165–6, note.]

[3] According to *Augusti* (l. c. pp. 450, 451), this strange usage was not known previous to the thirteenth century; but *Klee* asserts (Dogmengesch. ii. p. 165) that it existed as early as the eleventh century. At all events, it seems more likely that it had its origin in the customs of the *Knights* (as Klee supposes), than in certain rites which were observed when apprentices had served out their time (according to *Augusti*). But the proper *element* of this sacrament was the Chrisma, confectum ex oleo olivarum. Compare the authorities cited in notes 2 and 6. [The *form* was in the laying on of hands by the bishop, anointing the forehead with the sign of the cross, using the formula: *Consigno te signo crucis, et confirmo te chrismate salutis*, in nomine Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.

[4] *Thomas Aquinas*, l. c.: Character confirmationis ex necessitate præsupponit characterem baptismalem, etc. Confirmation, too, has a character indelebilis; hence it is not to be repeated.

[5] Concerning the godfathers and godmothers, see *Augusti*, l. c. p. 434. *Thomas Aquinas*, Art. 10; *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 214. The relation of godfathers and godmothers in confirmation, is also a basis of ecclesiastical relationship. [This spiritual relationship is also considered as a hindrance to marriage. Boniface VIII. (1295) *in sexto Decretal.* L. iv., Tit. 3, cap. 1; Ex confirmatione quoque, seu frontis chrismatione spiritualis cognatio eisdem modis (as in baptism) contrahitur, matrimonia similiter impedicus contrahenda, et dirimens post contracta.]

[6] Conc. Florent. Col. 1055, quoted by *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 215.* [The Florence Council declared the *matter* of the sacrament to be—Chrisma confectum ex oleo: the *form* (as above, note 3); the bishop to be the *ordinary* administrator. The effect was—*robur*. Ideoque in *fronte*, ubi verecundiæ sedes est, *confirmandus inungitur*, ne Christi nomen confiteri erubescat, et præcipue crucem ejus...propter quod *signo crucis signatur*.]

[7] Trialog. Lib. iv. c. 14. *Schröckh*, Kircheng. xxxiv. p. 508. He doubted whether confirmation could be proved from Acts viii. 17 (as was generally supposed), and called it blasphemy, to maintain that bishops might again impart the Holy Spirit, which had already been imparted by baptism.—*Hus*, Art. ii. apud Trithem. Chron. Hirsaug. ann. 1402. *Klee*, l. c. p. 164. [The Council of Trent is against Hus, etc. in several canons. Sessio vii. De Conf. Can. i. ii.]

* The Greek Church has the sacrament of confirmation as well as the Latin; only (according to the older tradition of the church) it is performed immediately after baptism and every priest is empowered to do it: see Art. Greek Church, in *Herzog's* Realencyclop

§ 193.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

1. *The Controversy on the Eucharist previous to the Rise of Scholasticism. Paschasius Radbert and Ratramn. Berengar.*

Marheineke (comp. vol. i. § 73), p. 66, ss. *Ebrard*, i. 385. *Gfrörer*, Uber Pseudo-Isidor, in the Freib. Kath. Zeitschrift, 1847, p. 237, *sq.*

Though at the beginning of this period, forms of statement are sometimes employed, which can be interpreted of the Lord's Supper in a symbolical sense,[1] yet the usage,[2] fixed by the liturgies, was constantly shaped more in favor of the doctrine of transubstantiation. The violent controversy between the monks, *Paschasius Radbert* and *Ratramn*,[3] which degenerated into the most obscene discussions, and gave rise to appellations not less offensive, became the signal for new contests. The most eminent theologians of the age, such as *Rabanus Maurus*,[4] and *Scotus Erigena*,[5] took an active part in the dispute. *Gerbert*, whose reputation was great in those days, endeavored to illustrate the doctrine propounded by Paschasius, of a real change of the bread into the body of Christ, by the aid of geometrical diagrams.[6] It had been so generally adopted, as the orthodox doctrine, towards the middle of the eleventh century, that *Berengar*, Canon of Tours, and afterwards Archdeacon at Angers, who ventured to express doubts concerning its correctness in a letter addressed to *Lanfranc*, was condemned, and obliged by several synods (at Vercelli and Rome, 1050–1079) to retract. He would have suffered still more, if Pope Gregory VII. had not at last succeeded in protecting him against the rage of his enemies.[7] Berengar, however, was far from rejecting every more spiritual conception, than that of a mere sign. Nor did he take offence at the use of the phrase, "to partake of the body and blood of Christ," but he explained it in a more or less ideal manner.[8] On the other hand, Cardinal *Humbert* was carried so far by his violent zeal, as to interpret the phrase in question in the grossest (Capernaitic) manner.[9] It then became impossible to adopt any moderate view; and later theologians found little more to do than to conceal the more objectionable aspect of the doctrine by an increased subtlety of argumentation, and to surround the impenetrable mystery, as it were, with a thorny hedge of syllogisms, as is exemplified in the scholastic distinction made by Lanfranc between the subject and the accidents.[10]

[1] Thus in the *Venerable Bede* (in Marci Evangel. Opera, Tom. v. p. 192, and elsewhere), the passage in *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 223, *sq.*

[He says, it is instituted, in suæ redemptionis *memoriam*: and, panem *certi* quoque gratia *sacramenti*, priusquam frangeret, benedixit. In his Homil. Hiemalis (Tom. vii., col. 320), he says that the bread and wine—in sacramentum carnis et sanguinis ejus ineffabili Spiritus sanctificatione transfertur.] So, too, in *Walafried Strabo* (*Ebrard*, 366), *Alcuin*, etc. As early as the times of Charlemagne, however, theologians seemed agreed, that, in the bread and the wine of the Lord's Supper, we are to adore more than *mere* signs, De impio Imaginum Cultu Lib. vi. c. 14, p. 461); see *Münscher*, von Cölln, 224, *sq.* *Amalarius* of Metz speaks out with special emphasis (about 820); in the Spicileg. T. vii. (see *Ebrard*, 363:) Ecclesiæ sacrificium præsens mandendum esse ab humano ore; credit namque corpus et sanguinem Domini esse, et hoc morsu benedictione cœlesti impleri animas sumentium. Moreover, he will not decide, utrum invisibiliter assumatur in cœlum an reservetur in corpore nostro usque in diem sepulturæ, an exhaletur in auras, aut exeat de corpore cum sanguine, an per poros emittatur.

[2] Compare *Ebrard*, ubi supra, 370, *sq.*

[2] *Paschasius Radbert* (monachius Corbeiensis) in his Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini (addressed to the Emperor Charles the Bald, between the years 830 and 832.) See *Martène* and *Durand*, T. ix. col. 367–470, and extracts from it in *Rössler*, x. p. 616, ss. He started from the omnipotence of God, to whom all things are possible, and consequently maintained ii. 2. sensibilis res intelligibiliter virtute Dei per verbum Christi in carnem ipsius ac sanguinem divinitus transfertur. He looked upon the elements as no more than a veil (in a Docetic way) which deceives our senses, and keeps the body of Christ concealed from us: Figura videtur esse dum frangitur, dum in specie visibili aliud intelligitur quam quod visu carnis et gustu sentitur. It is the same body which was born of Mary.—At times the true body of Christ has appeared to those who doubted (in order to encourage them), as well as to those who were strong in the faith (in order to reward them), instead of the bread (for the most part in the form of a lamb), or stains of blood have been perceived, etc.*—He was opposed by *Ratramn* (Bertramn) in his treatise: De Corpore et Sanguine Domini ad Carolum Calvum (it was written at the request of the king; extracts are given by *Schröckh*, xxiii. p. 445; *Neander*, iv.; and *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 230–235.) [Extracts in Gieseler (New York ed.) ii. 80, *sq.* An English translation of Ratramn was published in 1548, 1549. Sir Humphrey Lynde made another, 1623, reprinted, 1686. Dr. Hopkins, canon of Worcester, published the text and an English version, 1686, exposing the corruptions of Boileau's version; another edition, 1688. It has been republished at Oxford several times. An American edition was published in Baltimore (with the Saxon Homily of Ælfric), in 1843.] Ratramn properly distinguished between the sign, and the thing represented by it (figura et veritas), the internal and the external, and pointed out the true significance of the *mysteries*, which consists in this, that through their medium the mind of man rises from the visible to the invisible. If it were possible to eat the body of Christ, in the proper sense of the word, faith would be no longer required, and the

* Concerning such miraculous appearances, compare also Bossuet, edited by Cramer, v. 2. p. 105.

mystery, as such, would lose all its significance. The gross reality would destroy the idea, and nothing but a mere materialialism would remain. Ratramn also supposed a *conversio* of the bread and wine into the body of Christ, but only in the ideal sense of the word, as the ancient church held to a transition from the profane to the pure (sub velamento corporei panis corporeique vini spirituale corpus Christi spiritualisque sanguis existit). The mnemonic character is emphasized; and he also appealed to the authority of earlier writers. Respecting the later appellation, *Stercoranists* (in allusion to Matt. xv. 17), which had its origin in these discussions (Paschasius, c. 20, 2), see *Schröckh*, xxiii. p. 493, ss., and *Pfaff*. C. M.; Tractatus de Stercoranistis medii ævi. Tub. 1750, 4°.* [Comp. *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 457, *sq.*]

[4] The treatise of *Rabanus* addressed to Egilo, abbot of Prum, was professedly edited by Mabillon (Acta SS. T. vi.); but both *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 229, and *Neander*, Church Hist. iii. 457, *sq.*, deny the genuineness of that edition. The real opinion of Rabanus may be inferred from the following passage (De Justit. Cleric. i. c. 31, and iii. 13, quoted by *Gieseler*, ii. p. 80, § 14, note, and *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, l. c.): Maluit enim Dominus corporis et sanguinis sui sacramenta fidelium ore percipi, et in pastum eorum redigi, ut per visibile opus invisibilis ostenderetur effectus. Sicut enim cibus materialis *forinsecus* nutrit corpus et vegetat, ita etiam verbum Dei *intus animam* nutrit et roborat.... Sacramentum ore percipitur, *virtute* sacramenti interior homo satiatur. Sacramentum in alimentum corporis redigitur, virtute autem sacramenti æterna vita adipiscitur.

[5] This was at least the common opinion (compare the letter of Berengar to Lanfranc). It is, however, uncertain, whether the treatise (de Eucharistia) commonly ascribed to Scotus, which was condemned by the Synod of Vercelli (A. D. 1050), is the same with the treatise ascribed to Ratramn (as *De Marca* says, who ascribes it to Scotus), or whether we have here two distinct treatises; see *Gieseler*, as above. *F. W. Lauf* (Studien und Kritiken, 1828, part 4, p. 755, ss.), ascribes the authorship to Ratramn, and denies it of Scotus. Compare also *Neander*, as above; he thinks it probable, that Scotus gave his opinion on the subject in question, though the notion of a lost treatise written by him may have arisen from a mistake. To judge from some passages contained in his treatise De Div. Nat. (quoted by Neander, l. c.) he would not have given countenance to the doctrine propounded by Paschasius. [*Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 459, says that the doctrine of Scotus was as follows: He taught like some of the Greek Fathers, that the glorified body of Christ by its union with the divinity was freed from the defects of a sensuous nature. He impugned those who said, that the body of Christ after the resurrection occupied some limited space, and held to its ubiquity.

* A controversy of quite as unprofitable a nature was carried on between the above named *Amalarius* (who composed a liturgical work about the year 820), and the priest *Guntrad*, concerning spitting during the celebration of the mass; see *d'Achery*, Spicil. T. iii. in *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. xxiii. p. 496. Gerbert (De Corpore et Sanguine Christi) remarks against the Stercoranistic inferences: Et nos sæpe vidimus non modo infirmos, sed etiam sanos, quod per se intromittunt, per vomitum dejecisse.....subtilior tamen succus per membra usque ad ungues diffundebatur. "*That surely was medicinal*," *Ebrard*, p. 439.

He denied the doctrine of transubstantiation, and admitted a spiritual presence at the Supper: Christ's presence here is a symbol of his presence everywhere.]

[6] De Corpore et Sanguine Domini, edited by *Pez*, in Thesaur. Anecdd. Noviss. T. i. P. ii. f. 133. *Schröckh*, xxiii. p. 493.* Gerbert also tried to make clear the relation between Christ, the Supper, and the church, in a logical way, by the three terms of the syllogism, or the three parts of an arithmetical proportion; see *Ritter*, vii. 304; *Ebrard*, 438.

[7] On the external history of the controversy, see *Mabillon*, J. Dissert. de multiplici Berengarii Damnatione, Fidei Professione et Relapsu, deque ejus Pœnitentia, in *J. Vogtii* Biblioth. Hæresiolog. Hamb., 1723. Tom. i. Fasc. i. p. 99, ss.; *Schröckh*, xxiii. p. 507, ss.; *Neander*, iv.: and *Gieseler*, ii. § 29. —*Sources from which his opinions may be ascertained*, are: the Epistles of his school-fellow, *Adelmann*, De Veritate Corp. et Sang. Domini, ad Berengarium (which he wrote previous to his nomination as bishop of Brixen in Tyrol, A. D. 1049), edited by *J. Coster*, Lovan, 1551, in Biblioth, Patrum T. xviii., and by *Schmidt*, Brunsv., 1770. 8; *Hugonis Lingonensis* Lib. de Corpore et Sanguine Dom. (d'Achery in Opp. Lanfranci. Append. p. 68, ss. Biblioth. Patrum T. xviii. p. 417, ss.); *Lanfrancus*, de Corp. et Sang. Dom. adversus Berengar. Turonens. which was composed between the years 1063 and 70), in Opp. ed. L. d'Achery, Lutet. 1648, and Biblioth. Patrum T. xviii. p. 763–777. This work also contains the *first* treatise which Berengar wrote in opposition to Lanfranc, from which we must distinguish his second: Liber de sacra Cœna advers. Lanfrancum (edited by Stäudlin in 6 programmes. Gött. 1820–29, 4.)—Comp. *Lessing*, *Gotth. Ephr.*, Berengarius Turonensis, Braunschweig, 1770, 4 (in the edition of his complete works publ. Berlin, 1825, ss., vol. xii. p. 143, ss.); *Stäudlins* and *Tzschirners* Archiv für Kirchengeschichte, vol. ii. part. i. p. 1–98. *Berengarii Turonensis quæ supersunt tam edita quam inedita, typis expressa, moderante A. Neandro T. i. Berol. 1834. (Berengarii de Sacra Cœna adv. Lanfrancum, liber posterior, e codice Guelferbytano primum ediderunt *A. E.* et *F. Th. Vischer*. ibid. 1834.) A more detailed account of the literature is given by Gieseler, l. c. *Leading historical facts:* The first condemnation of Berengar, A. D. 1050, at Rome under Pope Leo IX., without an opportunity of defence. —The repetition of the sentence passed upon him at Vercelli in the same year.—On the supposed council of Paris, see Neander, l. c.—Council at Tours (A. D. 1054.)—Berengar's justification with the assistance of Hildebrand.—Another council at Rome (A. D. 1059.)—The violent conduct of Humbert.—The inconstancy manifested by Berengar in this matter.—Correspondence with Lanfranc.—Other Synods at Rome (A. D. 1078 and 1079. —Berengar again submitted to sign the confession of faith drawn up by his enemies, but retracted afterwards.—The Litteræ Commendatitiæ of Pope Gregory VII.—Berengar's death on the isle of St. Côme, near Tours, A. D. 1088.

* Gerbert's method of illustrating such supernatural truths by ocular demonstration, was imitated even by later theologians. Thus Melancthon informs us, that his tutor *Lempus*, at Tubingen, drew a representation of transubstantiation on a board (Ep. de suis studiis, written A. D. 1541. See *Galle*, Melancthon, p. C.)

Berengar combated principally the doctrine of an entire *change*, in such a manner as to make the bread cease to be bread, and to have nothing left but the accidents, for then in reality a portiuncula carnis was eaten instead of bread. In accordance with the earlier fathers, he retained the doctrine of a change from an inferior to a superior form, and of a mystical participation in the body of Christ under the figure of bread, p. 67 (edit. Vischer): Dum enim dicitur: panis et vinum sacramenta sunt, minime panis aufertur et vinum, et nominibus rerum ita natarum significativis aptatur nomen, quod non nata sunt, ut est sacramentum; simul etiam esse aliud aliquid minime prohibentur, sunt enim, *sicut secundum religionem sacramenta, ita secundum aliud alimenta, sustentamenta.* The subject, of which anything is predicated, must *remain the same*, otherwise that which is predicated would have no meaning. Pag. 71: Dun dicitur: panis in altari consecratur, vel panis sanctus, panis sacrosanctus est Christi corpus, omni veritate panis superesse conceditur. Verbi gratia, si enuntias: Socrates justus est, aliquid eum esse constituisti, nec potest justus esse, si contingat, Socratem non esse. Pag. 76: Sicut enim, qui dicit: Christus est lapis angularis, non revera Christum lapidem esse constituit, sed propter aliquam similitudinem, quam ad se invicem gerunt, tale nomen ei imponit, eodem modo, cum divina pagina corpus domini panem vocat, sacrata ac mystica locutione id agit. Pag. 86: Quando autem afferuntur ad altare vel ponuntur in altari, adhuc sunt, ut ait beatus Augustinus contra Faustum, alimenta refectionis, nondum sacramenta religionis, (h)ac per hoc, nondum corpus Christi et sanguis existentia, non tropica, sed propria sunt locutione pendenda. Dicens ergo Humbertus ille tuus, panem, qui ponitur in altari, post consecrationem esse corpus Christi, panem propria locutione, corpus Christi tropica accipiendum esse constituit, et illud quidem recte, quia ex auctoritate scripturarum.—Pag. 90: Dicitur autem in scripturis panis altaris de pane fieri corpus Christi, sicut servus malus dicitur fieri de malo servo bonus filius, non quia amiserit animæ propriæ naturam aut corporis.—Pag. 91: Unde insanissimum dictu erat et christianæ religioni contumeliosissimum, corpus Christi de pane vel de quocunque confici per generationem subjecti.....ut pane absumto per corruptionem subjecti corpus Christi esse incipiat per generationem subjecti, quia nec pro parte, nec pro toto potest incipere nunc esse corpus Christi.—Pag. 95: Novit autem revera secundum carnem Christum, qui Christi corpus asserit adhuc esse corruptioni vel generationi obnoxium, vel quarumcunque qualitatum vel collineationum, quas prius non habuerit, susceptivum.—Pag. 98: Denique verbum caro factum assumsit quod non erat, non amittens quod erat, et panis consecratus in altari amisit vilitatem, amisit inefficaciam, non amisit naturæ proprietatem, cui naturæ quasi loco, quasi fundamento dignitas divinitus augeretur et efficacia. (A comparison is drawn between the change in question, and the change at the conversion of Saul into Paul, p. 144.)—Pag. 161: Est ergo vera procul dubio panis et vini per consecrationem altaris conversio in corpus Christi et sanguinem, sed attendendum, quod dicitur: *per consecrationem*, quia hic est hujus conversionis modus, etc.....Pag. 163: Per consecrationem, inquam, quod nemo interpretari poterit: per subjecti corruptionem.—Pag. 167: Sed quomodo manducandus est Christus? Quomodo ipse dicit: qui manducat carnem meam et bibit sanguinem meum,

in me manet et ego in eo; si in me manet, et ego in illo, tunc manducat, tunc bibit; qui autem non in me manet, nec ego in illo, etsi accipit sacramentum, adquirit magnum tormentum.—Pag. 171: Apud eruditos enim constat, et eis, qui vecordes non sint, omnino est perceptibile, nulla ratione colorem videri, nisi contingat etiam coloratum videri. Ita enim scribit Lanfrancus, colorem et qualitates portiunculæ carnis Christi, quam sensualiter esse in altari desipit, videri oculis corporis, ut tamen caro illa, cujus color videtur, omnino sit invisibilis, cum constet, omne quod in subjecto est, sicut, ut sit, ita etiam, ut videatur, non a se habere, sed a subjecto, in quo sit, nec visu vel sensuo aliquo corporeo comprehendi colorem vel qualitatem, nisi comprehenso quali et colorato.*—Pag. 188: Rerum exteriorum est, panis et vini est, confici, consecrari; hæc incipere possunt esse, quod non erant, corpus Christi et sanguis, sed per consecrationem, non per corruptionem panis et vini et generationem corporis Christi et sanguinis, quæ constat semel potuisse generari.—Pag. 191:.....Verissimum est nec ulla tergiversatione dissimulari potest, aliud esse totum corpus Christi, quod ante mille annos sibi fabricavit in utero virginis sapientia Dei, aliud portiunculam carnis, quam tu tibi facis de pane per corruptionem panis ipsius hodie factam in altari per generationem ipsius carnis.—Further passages are quoted by Gieseler, ii. as above, p. 172, *sq.*, ss. *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 242, ss. Comp. especially his confession of faith made (though with reservation) at the Synod of Rome (A. D. 1078), in Mansi, xix. p. 761. *Gieseler*, ii. § 29: Profiteor, panem altaris post consecrationem esse verum corpus Christi, quod natum est de virgine, quod passum est in cruce, quod sedet ad dexteram Patris, et vinum altaris, postquam consecratum est, esse verum sanguinem, qui manavit de latere Christi. Et sicut ore pronuncio, ita me corde habere confirmo. Sic me adjuvet Deus et hæc sacra.

[9] According to the confession of faith imposed by Humbert upon Berengar at the Synod of Rome (A. D. 1059), he was to take an oath, in the name of the Holy Trinity, that he believed: Panem et vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse, et sensualiter, non solum sacramento, sed in veritate *manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi et fidelium dentibus atteri*; he retracted, however, as soon as he had obtained his liberty. [Comp. *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 460, *sq.*]

[10] The doctrine of *Lanfranc*, though propounded in less rigid terms than that of Humbert, was, nevertheless, opposed to the view adopted by Berengar, and rendered impossible any further attempt to return to a symbolising and spiritualising interpretation. He taught (l. c. c. 18, p. 772, quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 244): Credimus terrenas substantias, quæ in mensa dominica per sacerdotale ministerium divinitus sanctificantur, ineffabiliter, incomprehensibiliter, mirabiliter, operante superna potentia, converti in essentiam dominici corporis, reservatis ipsarum rerum speciebus et quibusdam aliis qualitatibus, ne percipientes cruda et cruenta horrerent, et ut credentes fidei præmia ampliora perciperent: ipso tamen

* Only in so far may it be said that the bread of the Lord's Supper is no bread; as Christ says, My doctrine is not mine, but his who sent me; or Paul: I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me. Comp. p. 178.

dominico corpore existente in cœlestibus ad dexteram Patris, immortali, inviolato, integro, incontaminato, illæso: ut vere dici possit, et ipsum corpus quod de Virgine sumtum est nos sumere, et tamen non ipsum. Ipsum quidem, quantum ad essentiam veræque naturæ proprietatem atque naturam; non ipsum autem, si spectes panis vinique speciem cæteraque superius comprehensa. Hanc fidem tenuit a priscis temporibus et nunc tenet ecclesia, quæ per totum effusa orbem catholica nominatur. (To this last view Berengar opposed proofs drawn from the writings of Ambrose and Augustine, in the treatise above mentioned. Comp. note 8.)

§ 194.

2. *The Scholastic Development of the Doctrine. Transubstantiation. The Sacrifice of the Mass.*

A word is often of great consequence! *Hildebert of Tours* was the first who made use of the full-sounding term "*transubstantiatio*,"[1] though similar expressions, such as *transitio*, had previously been employed.[2] Most of the earlier scholastics,[3] and the disciples of Lanfranc in particular, had defended the doctrine of the change of the bread into the body of Chrst, and the doctrine of the *accidentia sine subjecto*; these were now solemnly confirmed, by being inserted *together with* the term *transubstantiatio* into the Decretum Gratiani,[4] and were made an unchangeable article of faith by Pope Innocent III.[5] Thus nothing was left to the later scholastics, but to answer still more subtle questions, such as: In what respect can it be said that the body of Christ is actually broken together with the bread?[6] Do animals partake of the body of Christ, when they happen to swallow a consecrated host?[7] Is the bread used in the Lord's Supper changed only into the flesh of our Lord, or also into his blood? (the doctrine of what is called *concomitance*.)[8] Is the bread, in the former case, changed only into the flesh of Christ, or also into his body and soul, or into his divinity itself, or even into the Holy Trinity?[9] Does the change take place gradually, or suddenly?[10] Is there only *one* body in the multitude of hosts, so that the same Christ is sacrified at the same time upon all altars, which constitutes the mystery of the mass?[11]—By the institution of the Corpus-Christi-day by Pope Urban IV. (A. D. 1264), and Pope Clement V. (A. D. 1311), at the Synod of Vienne, the doctrine in question was expressed in a liturgical form, and its popularity secured.[12] Henceforth the sacrifice of the mass formed more than ever the centre of the catholic ritual,[13] and reflected new glory upon the priesthood. Nevertheless many pious minds found elevation and powerful motives, in the idea of a special presence of the Redeemer, and the daily repetition of his sacrifice, as well as in that of the mystical

union with him in the act of communion. Thus here again it became the office of the idealising mystics, by the spirit of inward contemplation, to transform into a heavenly manna, what the scholastics had brought down into the sphere of the external and earthly.[1]

[1] In Sermo VI. Opp. Col. 689; comp. Sermo V. in Cœna Domini, Opp. Col. 422; and De Sacram. Altaris, Opp. Col. 1106, quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, pp. 249, 250. [In his Sermo VI. Opera, 689: eum profero verba Canonis (sc. Missæ), et verbum Transsubstantiationis. In his Sermo V. he defines:—ita ut panis substantia non remaneat.....et sub illa specie veram corporis substantiam latere: ne, si in ea qualitate in qua revera est appareret, verum hominis sumere abhorreret.]

[2] Thus by *Hugo of St. Victor*, see *Liebner*, p. 455, ss.

[3] *Anselm*, a disciple of Lanfranc, followed the example of his master in his Tractatus bipartitus de Corpore et Sanguine Domini, sive de Sacramento Altaris. (Disputatio dialectica de grammatico, P. ii.) P. i.....Sicut in mensa nuptiali aqua in vinum mutata solum adfuit vinum, in quod aqua mutata erat: sic in mensa altaris solum corpus Domini, in quod vere mutata est vera panis substantia; nisi, quod de aqua nihil remansit in mutatione illa, de pane vero mutato, ad peragendum sacri institutum mysterii, sola remanet species visibilis. (He expressly condemns the heretical doctrine of Berengar.) Yet we ought not to think of the transaction as something magical: Nihil enim falsum factum putandum est in sacrificio veritatis, sicut fit in magorum præstigiis, ubi delusione quadam falluntur oculi, ut videatur illis esse, quod non est omnino. Sed vera species visibilis panis, quæ fuit in pane, ipsa facta præter substantiam suam quodammodo in aliena peregrinatur, continente eum, qui fecit eam et ad suum transferente corpus. Quæ tamen translata ad corpus Domini, non eo modo se habet ad illud, quomodo accidens ad substantiam: quia corpus Domini in substantia sua, nec album efficit albedo illa, nec rotundum rotunditas, sicque de reliquis. —Nor ought we to rest satisfied with the mere carnal participation. P. ii. c. 12: Et cum de altari sumimus carnem Jesu, curemus solicite, ne cogitatione remaneamus in carne, et a spiritu non vivificemur; quodsi non vivificamur a spiritu, caro non prodest quicquam, etc. (comp. note 12.) The principles of Lanfranc were also partially adopted by *Durandus*, Abbas Troarnensis (he died, A. D. 1088), De Corp. et Sang. Domini, c. Bereng. (in Bibl. PP. Max. T. xviii. p. 419; Galland, T. xiv. p. 245), and *Guitmundus* Archiepisc. Aversanus, de Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Veritate in Eucharistia, libr. iii. (in Bibl. PP. Max., T. xviii. p. 441). *Eusebius Bruno* (bishop of Anjou), whom Durandus numbered among the followers of Berengar, wished to have a stop put to all discussions concerning this sacrament (see *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, pp. 247, 248.)—But in vain! The theory of Paschasius and Lanfranc gained the victory.—*Hugo of St. Victor* himself called the few advocates of Berengar's doctrine "perverters of Scripture," and distinctly opposed a *mere* symbolical interpretation, though he would have retained it together with the real (see *Liebner*, p. 453, ss.)—*Peter Lombard* appealed, Sent. Lib. iv Dist. 10. D. to (Pseudo-) Ambrose, De initiand.

mysteriis (Vol. i. § 138, note 3): Ex his (continues he) aliisque pluribus constat, verum corpus Christi et sanguinem in altari esse, immo integrum Christum ibi sub utraque specie et substantiam panis in corpus, vinique substantiam in sanguinem converti.—But he confesses his inability to explain the *mode* of that change, Dist. xi. A.: Si autem quæritur, qualis sit illa conversio, an formalis, an substantialis, vel alterius generis, definire non sufficio. Formalem tamen non esse cognosco, quia species rerum, quæ ante fuerant, remanent, et sapor et pondus. Quibusdam esse videtur substantialis, dicentibus sic substantiam converti in substantiam, ut hæc essentialiter fiat illa, si sensui præmissæ auctoritates consentire videntur.—B.: Sed huic sententiæ sic opponitur ab aliis: Si substantia panis, inquiunt, vel vini convertitur substantialiter in corpus vel sanguinem Christi, quotidie fit aliqua substantia corpus vel sanguis Christi, quæ ante non erat corpus, et hodie est aliquid corpus Christi, quod heri non erat, et quotidie augetur corpus Christi atque formatur de materia, de qua in conceptione non fuit factum. Quibus hoc modo responderi potest, quia non ea ratione dicitur corpus Christi confici verbo cœlesti, quod ipsum corpus in conceptu virginis formatum deinceps formetur: sed quia substantia panis vel vini, quæ ante non fuerunt corpus Christi vel sanguis, verbo cœlesti fit corpus et sanguis. Et ideo *sacerdotes dicuntur conficere corpus Christi et sanguinem*, quia eorum ministerio substantia panis fit caro, et substantia vini fit sanguis Christi, nec tamen aliquid additur corpori vel sanguini, nec augetur corpus Christi vel sanguis.—C.: Si vero quæris modum, quo id fieri possit, breviter respondeo: Mysterium fidei credi salubriter potest, investigari salubriter non potest. Comp. Dist. xii. A: Si autem quæritur de accidentibus, quæ remanent, *i. e.* de speciebus et sapore et pondere, in quo subjecto fundentur, potius mihi videtur fatendum existere sine subjecto quam esse in subjecto, quia ibi non est substantia, nisi corporis et sanguinis dominici, quæ non afficitur illis accidentibus. Non enim corpus Christi talem habit in se formam, sed qualis in judicio apparebit. Remanent ergo illa accidentia per se subsistentia ad mysterii ritum, ad gustus fideique suffragium: quibus corpus Christi, habens formam et naturam suam, tegitur.

[[4] The Decretum Gratiani was a "Concordia discordantium Canonum in Lib. iii." composed about the year 1150, by *Gratianus*, a Benedictine monk; it was also called Codex decretorum, Decreta Gratiani, and more frequently Decretum Grat. See *Gieseler*, l. c. ii., § 60, note 5. Hallam's Middle Ages, ii. p. 2, 8th edit. *Thomas Grvenwood*, Cathedra Petri, vol. iii. Lond., 1859. Book vi., chap. viii.]

[6] Conc. Lat. IV. c. i. (quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 251): Una est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur. In qua idem ipse sacerdos est sacrificium Jesus Christus, cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro. Et hoc utique sacramentum nemo potest conficere nisi sacerdos, qui rite fuerit ordinatus, secundum claves ecclesiæ, quas ipse concessit Apostolis eorumque successoribus Jesus Christus. Pope Innocent III. himself maintained, de Mysteriis Missæ. l. iv. c. 7: Non solum accidentales, sed etiam

naturales proprietates remanere: *paneitatem*, quæ satiando famem expellit et *vineitatem*, quæ satiando sitim expellit.

[6] *Thomas Aquinas* (Summ. P. iii. Qu. 75, Art. 6, and 7, Qu. 76, Art. 3) made the assertion, that the body is broken only secundum speciem sacramentalem, but is itself incorruptibile et impassibile: see the passages quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, pp. 253, 254. [Aquinas argues, in Art. 6, against those who maintained, that the *forma substantialis* of the bread remained; for, 1. if the substantial form remains, the mere *matter* alone is changed, and not the form, whereas the words of institution say, This is my *body*. 2. Because this substantial form remained, it must be either *in*, or *separate from* the matter; both of which are in the case impossible, etc. Qu. 77, Art. 1: Relinquitur quod accidentia in hoc sacramento maneat sine subjecto, quod quidem virtute divina fieri potest. *Baur*, p. 267: Aquinas says, transubstantiation is neither an annihilation nor a continuance of the substance; if the accidents abide without the substance, this is like the case of all miracles, a working of the first cause without the second causes. The whole Christ was conceived as being in each part of the species; and to explain how this could be, how a body of greater quantity could be in a smaller, not *dimensive*, but as a *substantial quantity*, the scholastics made distinction, which at last run out into this—that existence in space does not belong to the essence of things that appear in space. *Aquinas*, Dist. 76, Art. 4.] Christ is whole and undivided in every particle of the host. In the same way the consecrated wine, though other liquids may be added, remains the blood of Christ as long as it does not cease to be wine. Fortunately these subtile definitions required only a fides implicita, but not explicita; see *Cramer*, vii. pp. 728, 729. The theory of Thomas is more fully developed by *Engelhardt*, Dogmengeschichte, ii. p. 214, ss., note; *Ebrard*, i. 487. [*Hampden's* Bampton Lectures, Lect. vii.]

[7] *Peter Lombard*, started this question, Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 13, A., and decided: Illud sane dici potest, quod a brutis animalibus corpus Christi non sumitur, etsi videatur. Quid ergo sumit mus vel quid manducat! Deus novit hoc.—*Alexander Hales*, however, who lived about a century later, pretended to a better knowledge respecting this point (Summa P. iv. Qu. 45, Membr. 1, Art. 1 and 2). He took the affirmative side of the question, in support of which he asserted, that, if a *sinner* could receive the body of Christ, the same might be supposed, with much more propriety, in the case of an *innocent* animal: on the other hand, he professed to be aware that God abhors only the sin of the sinner, but not his human nature, which alone is susceptible of the beneficial effects of the sacrament. Nevertheless he was compelled to admit, that if a dog or a pig swallowed the unbroken host, the body of our Lord entered into the belly of the animal.—*Thomas Aquinas* held similar views, P. iii. Qu. 80, Art. 3: Etiamsi mus vel canis hostiam consecratam manducet, substantia corporis Christi non desinit esse sub speciebus, quamdiu species illæ manent, hoc est quamdiu substantia panis maneret; sicut etiam si projiceretur in lutum.—On the other hand, *Bonaventura* expressed himself with more propriety (after he had stated all that might be said for and against the doctrine) in Comment. ad. Sent. iv. Dist. 13, Art. 2, Qu. 1; Quantumcunque hæc opinio muniatur, nunquam

tamen ita munitur, *quamquam aures piæ hoc abhorreant audire*, quod in ventre muris vel in cloaca sit corpus Christi, quamdiu species ibi subsistunt. Propter hæc est alia opinio, quod corpus Christi nullo modo descendit in ventrem muris.....Et hæc opinio communior est, et certe honestior et rationabilior. Nevertheless this more appropriate and rational view was determined by the Synod of Paris, A. D. 1300, to be one of those articles, in quibus Magister Sententiarum non tenetur (*Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 255).—Thomas Aquinas, however, held, that an animal can partake of the body of Christ only accidentaliter, but not sacramentaliter: and Pope Innocent III. endeavored (De Myst. Missæ iv. 21,) to get rid of all difficulties by supposing that the body of our Lord left the host in the same miraculous way in which it had entered it (reconversio.) Compare *Wilhelm Holder's* satire: Mus exenteratus, etc., published in the sixteenth century, in *Meiners* and *Splitters* Neues Götting. historisches Magazin. Vol. ii. p. 716–734, where some other curiosities are collected.

[8] See the next section.

[9] The elements are, properly speaking, changed only into the body and blood of Christ, but his soul is united to his body, and his divine nature to his soul; see *Thomas Aquinas*, P. iii. Qu. 76, Art. 1. On the controversy which took place in the kingdom of Valencia, A. D. 1382 (respecting the transubstantiation of the bread into the whole Trinity), see *Baluze*, Notæ ad Vitas Paparum Avenionensis, T. i. p. 1368, ss. (from an ancient MS.); and *Schröckh*, xxxiii. p. 325.

[10] The transubstantiation takes place in instanti, not successive. Comp. *Alex. Hales*, P. iv. Qu. 10, Memb. 5, Art. 4. *Thom. Aquinas*, P. iii. Qu. 75, Art. 7. *Albertus Magnus*, Sentent. iv. Dist. 10, Art. 3. (*Klee*, Dogmengeschichte, ii. p. 204.)

[11] Thus Anselm said, l. c. P. ii. c. 4: Sic ergo constat, in diversis locis uno horæ momento esse posse corpus Christi, sed lege creatricis naturæ, non creatæ. The other scholastics adopted the same opinion. Similar views were also entertained by the mystics. Compare *Ruysbroek*, Specul. æternæ Salutis c. 8, and *Engelhardt's* monograph. p. 261: "All the bread which our Lord himself consecrated for his body (at the institution of the Lord's Supper),* as well as the bread which the priests now everywhere consecrate, is, according to its true nature, only *one* bread (only *one* bread in its nature.) In the act of consecration all the hosts, by means of the secret intention of the priest, and the enunciation of the words of consecration, are united into *one* matter, and *one* substance, and what was formerly bread, now becomes entirely the body of Christ....Every bit of bread, every drop of wine, contains the whole Christ, who is in heaven, but not confined to any particular place, as the *one* undivided soul is equally diffused throughout the body.... The body of Christ is present in all countries, places, and churches; hence we may preserve it in various ways, and keep it in various places; we may

* It was thought that Christ himself partook, by way of accommodation, of his own body, at the institution of the sacrament in question; see *Thomas Aquinas*, l. c. Qu. 81, *Schröckh*, xxxix. p. 163. On a chalice at Hildesheim is inscribed: Rex sedet in cœna, turba cinctus duodena, se tenet in manibus, se cibat ipse cibus. Comp. *Riemer*, Mittheilungen über Göthe, ii. 704.

have it, receive it, and give it in the casket. But as he exists in heaven having his hands, his feet, and all his members, and is seen by the angels and the redeemed in all his glory, he does not change his abode, and is ever present." —In illustration of such things, the instance was adduced of a mirror composed of many pieces in which a single image is variously reflected; see *Klee*, ii. p. 211.*

[12] Respecting the institution of this festival (whether in consequence of a revelation to Juliana of Liege?), see *Gieseler*, ii. § 77, notes 15 and 16.

[13] The idea of a sacrifice is intimately connected with that of transubstantiation. *Peter Lombard*, Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 12, g.: Breviter dici potest, illud quod offertur et consecratur a sacerdote vocari sacrificium et oblationem, quia memoria est et repræsentatio veri sacrificii et sanctæ immolationis factæ in ara crucis. Et semel Christus mortuus in cruce est ibique immolatus est in semetipso (Heb. vii. 27), quotidie autem immolatur in sacramento, quia in sacramento recordatio fit illius quod factum est semel. *Thomas Aquinas* entered into more lengthened discussions, Summ. P. iii. Qu. 83, Art. 1, ss. quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, pp. 270, 271. [*Aquinas*, after giving the aspects under which it can not be called an immolatio, says: *duplici* ratione celebratio hujus sacramenti dicitur immolatio Christi. *Primo* quidem quia....*imago quædam est repræsentativa passionis Christi, quæ est vera ejus immolatio*....*Alio modo* quantum ad *effectum* passionis Christi, quia scilicet per hoc sacramentum *participes efficimur fructus* Dominicæ passionis.] The mystical theory was, that Christ is both priest and sacrifice at the same time; see Conc. Lateran. IV. can. 1, note 4. Concerning the usual canon of the mass, the various kinds of mass (missæ solitaræ) etc., comp. the archeological and liturgical works of Calixt (Dissert. de Pontificio Missæ Sacrificio Francof. 1644, and de Missis Solitariis. Helmst. 1647–8); *Buddeus* (Dissert. de Origine Missæ Pontificiæ, in Miscell. Sacra, Jen., 1727, T. i. p. 1–63); and *Augusti* (Archæologie, vol. iv. and viii).—On the adoration of the host during the mass, as well as at other times (*e. g.* when it was carried to the sick, etc.), which may be dated from the thirteenth century, see *Cæsarius of Heisterbach*, De Miraculis et Visionibus sui Temporis Dialog. lib. ix. c. 51, quoted by *Gieseler*, ii. p. 485, § 77, note 14; and *C. de Lith.*, de Adoratione Panis consecrati et Interdictione sacri Calicis in Eucharistia. 1753–8. Decret. Gregorii IX. Lib. iii. Tit. 41, c. 10, (quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 262): Sacerdos vero quilibet frequenter doceat plebem suam, ut, cum in celebratione missarum elevatur hostia salutaris, quilibet se reverenter inclinet, idem faciens cum eam defert presbyter ad infirmum.

[14] This is the more cheering aspect of the history of the doctrine in question, which has too often been overlooked in works on the history of doctrines. Thus *Anselm* said, De Sacram. Altaris P. ii. c. 8 (p. 75): Cum ergo de carne

* Since every host contains the body of Christ, and one priest may lift up one host at the same time when another priest lowers down another, it follows, according to *W. Occam*, that a body may move at one and the same time in two different directions: Aristotle indeed makes the opposite assertion, yet this is because he looked at the matter merely from the natural point of view: see Centiloq. conclus. 27. *Rettberg* in the Studien und Kritiken, 1839, part 1, p. 76.

sua amandi se tantam ingerit materiam, magnum et mirificam animabus nostris vitæ alimoniam ministrat, quam tunc avidis faucibus sumimus, cum dulciter recolligimus et in ventre memoriæ recondimus, quæcunque pro nobis fecit et passus est Christus. Hoc est convivium de carne Jesu et sanguine, qui cum communicat, habet vitam in se manentem. Tunc enim communicamus, cum fide ardente, quæ per dilectionem operatur, reposuimus in mensa Domini, qualia ipsi sumsimus, videlicet, ut, sicut ille totum se præbuit pro salute nostra nulla sua necessitate, sic nos totos fidei ejus et charitati exhibeamus necessitate salutis nostræ. In hoc convivio quicunque saginatur, nescit panem suum otiosus comedere, sed solicite cum muliere ejus ardet de nocte hujus seculi consurgere ad lucernam verbi Dei, ut labores manuum suarum manducet, et bene sit ei. Sique in Christo manet bonus conviva Christi propriæ dilectionis affectu, habetque Christum in se manentum per sanctæ operationis effectum. Quod cum utrumque donum Dei sit, totum accrescit magis ac magis ad cumulum amoris in illum, quem perfecte amare est perfecte bonum esse. Hunc autem cibum plus manducat, qui amplius amat, et plus amando rursus qui plus et plus manducat, et plus et plus amat. Licet hujus amoris in hac vita non nisi pignus quoddam accipiamus, plenitudinem ejus, in præmium, in futuro seculo expectantes. Et ecce hoc est manducare illam carnem, de qua dicit Jesus [John, vi.]: Qui manducat carnem meam, in me manet et ego in eo.—Similar language was used by *Hugo of St. Victor*, who here again, "*combined the dialectic prudence of the scholastics with the warmth and depth of the mystics.*" He expressed himself as follows (Lib. i. P. viii. c. 5):—"He who eats without being united to Christ, has the sacrament indeed, but he has not the essence of the sacrament. On the contrary, he who eats and is united to our Lord, has the essence of the sacrament, because he has faith and love. Even suppose he could neither take nor eat, yet he would be far more esteemed by our Lord than he who takes and eats, but neither believes nor loves, or he who believes, but does not love." (*Liebner*, p. 435.) Comp. *Bonaventura*, Sent. iv. Dist. x. P. 1, Qu. 1, Art. 1, quoted by *Klee*, Dogmengesch. ii. p. 190. [*B.* says: "As many we need union, as pilgrims we need food, as sinners, a daily sacrifice: that which unites, feeds and purifies, can only be God, or what is joined to God, that is, the body of Christ." He further shows how faith, hope, and love, and humility were nourished by this sacrament.] Comp. Breviloq. vi. 9, Centiloq. iii. 50.—*Tauler*, 4 Predigten auf unsers Herrn Frohnleichnamstag (vol. ii. p. 178, ss.); 2 Predigten von dem heiligen Sacrament (ibid. p. 294, ss., comp. p. 333, ss.) *Ruysbroek*, l. c.—*Gerson*, Sermo de Eucharistia in Festo Corporis Domini; Opp. P. i. p. 1284–92. His illustrations are all pervaded by the spirit of mysticism; thus he says, p. 1219: Est panis angelorum, qui factus fuit et formatus in pretioso ventre Virginis gloriosæ et decoctus in fornace ardente dilectionis, in arbore crucis, qui manducari debet cum baculo spei, cum boni exempli califactorio, cum acetosis lachrymis bonæ patientiæ, velociter recordando finem nostrum, in una domo per unitatem integre, per veram credulitatem, tostus per ignem charitatis, etc.—*Suso* calls the Lord's Supper the sacrament of love, and celebrated in it the mystic union of the soul with God; see his Ewige Weisheit, fol. (in *Schmidt*, loc. cit. 51; *Diepenbroek*, 350).—In like manner *Thomas à Kempis*, De Imit.

Christi Lib. iv. 4: Ecce, unde dilectio procedit, qualis dignatio illucescit! quam magnæ gratiarum actiones et laudes tibi pro his debentur! O quam salutare et utile consilium tuum, cum istud instituisti! quam suave et jucundum convivium, cum te ipsum in cibum donasti! O quam admirabilis operatio tua, Domine! quam potens virtus tua, quam ineffabilis veritas tua! Dixisti enim, et facta sunt omnia, et hoc factum est, quod ipse jussisti. 5: Mira res et fide digna, ac humanum vincens intellectum, quod tu, Domine Deus meus, verús Deus et homo, sub modica specie panis et vini integer contineris, et sine consumtione a sumente manducaris. Tu Domine universorum, qui nullius habes indigentiam, voluisti per Sacramentum tuum habitare in nobis: conserva cor meum et corpus immaculatum, ut læta et pura conscientia sæpius tua valeam celebrare mysteria, et ad meam perpetuam accipere salutem, quæ ad tuum præcique honorem et memoriale perenne sanxisti et instituisti.—6: Lætare, anima mea, et gratias age Deo pro tam nobili munere et solatio singulari in hac lacrymarum valle tibi relicto. Nam quoties hoc mysterium recolis et Christi corpus accipis, toties tuæ redemtionis opus agis, et particeps omnium meritorum Christi efficeris. Charitas enim Christi nunquam minuitur et magnitudo propitiationis ejus nunquam exhauritur. Ideo nova semper mentis renovatione ad hoc disponere te debes, et magnum salutis mysterium attenta consideratione pensare. Ita magnum, novum et jucundum tibi videri debet, cum celebras aut Missam audis, ac si eodem die Christus primum in uterum Virginis descendens homo factus esset, aut si in cruce pendens pro salute hominum pateretur et moretur.—*Wessel* entertained similar views (though he somewhat differed from the ecclesiastical doctrine, see § 196, note 7), comp. De Orat. viii. 6, p. 148; de Sacrament. Eucharist. C. 26, p. 699, quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 329: "The bread set before believers, is the purest and most perfect mirror of love, lifted up on the hills, that all may see it, and none hide himself from its warming beams," etc.

§ 195.

THE WITHHOLDING OF THE CUP FROM THE LAITY. CONCOMITANCE.

**Spittler*, Geschichte des Kelches im Abendmahl. Lemgo, 1780.

In the Western Church the custom was gradually adopted of administering to the laity only the consecrated host, while the priests alone partook of the cup.[1] In defence of such a practice, theologians advanced the doctrine of *concomitance*, developed about the same time, according to which Christ exists wholly in each of the elements, so that those who receive the consecrated host, partake of his blood no less than of his body.[2] *Robert Pulleyn* is said to have been the first who claimed the participation of the cup as the prerogative of the clergy.[3] *Alexander Hales*, *Bonaventura*, and *Thomas Aquinas*, followed him. But *Albertus Magnus*, while conceding that the blood of Christ was also present in the body,

said that this was—ex unione naturali, and not, ex virtute sacramentali.[5] In the fifteenth century the cup was again violently reclaimed in Bohemia. It was not at first, *Hus*, but his colleague, *Jacobellus of Misa*, who demanded, in the absence of the former, that the laity should be readmitted to the participation of the Lord's Supper *sub utraque forma*. Hus afterwards approved of what he had done.[6] It is well known that this demand, which was in opposition to the Synod of Constance,[7] gave rise to the wars of the Husites. The consequence was, that the council of Basle confirmed the doctrine of the Church, according to which it is sufficient to partake of the Lord's Supper sub *una* forma; but it permitted exceptions when the Church deemed it desirable.[8]

[1] Had this custom its origin in the apprehension that some portion of the wine might be spilt? Concerning the dipping of the bread—the introduction of the Fistulæ (cannæ eucharisticæ), etc., see *Spittler*, l. c. and the works on ecclesiastical history and archæology: *Augusti*, Archæologie viii. p. 392, ss., comp. p. 485. (Comp. § 194, note 12.)

[2] *Peter Lombard* taught, Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 10, D (in calce): Integrum Christum esse in altari sub utraque specie, et substantiam panis in corpus, vinique substantiam in sanguinem converti. *Thomas Aquinas* was the first who made use of the term *concomitantia* in Summa, P. iii. Qu. 76. Art. 1: Sciendum, quod aliquid Christi est in hoc sacramento dupliciter: uno modo quasi ex vi sacramenti, alio modo *ex naturali concomitantia*. Ex vi quidem sacramenti est sub speciebus hujus sacramenti id, in quod directe convertitur substantia panis et vini præexistens, prout significatur per verba formæ, quæ sunt effectiva in hoc sacramento.....Ex naturali autem concomitantia est in hoc sacramento illud, quod realiter est conjunctum ei, in quod prædicta conversio terminatur. Si enim aliqua duo sunt realiter conjuncta, ubicunque est unum realiter, oportet et aliud esse. Sol enim operatione animæ discernuntur, quæ realiter sunt conjuncta. (He made use of the same concomitance to explain the union of the soul and the divine nature of Christ with his body. Compare above § 194, note 9.) [On *Folmar*, of Traufenstein, in Franconia, who opposed the Concomitance, see *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 535.]

[3] Sent. P. viii. c. 3 (he spoke of the danger alluded to above). The command of Christ: "*Drink ye all of it*," was applied to the priests, as the successors of the apostles. See *Cramer*, vi. pp. 515, 516.

[4] *Alexander Hales*, Summa, P. iv. Qu. 53, Membr. 1, quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 263. [*Alexander* here says, the church gives the sacrament—sub specie panis tantum, tum propter *periculum effusionis*, quod forte accideret si sub specie vini dispensaretur; tum propter *vitii infidelitatis* amotionem, quod se non immerito simplicium mentibus ingereret, si semper sub speciebus panis et vini daretur; quia si ita fieret, possent simpliciores credere, quod Christus non contineretur integre sub altera specie, sicut contingit quandoque. *Bonaventura* assigns the same reasons.] *Bonaventura* in Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 11, p. 2, Art. 1, Qu. 2 (ibidem.) *Thomas Aquinas*, see above, note 2.

[5] *Giesler*, Dogmengesch. 544.

[6] *Æneæ Sylvii* Historia Bohemica c. 35. *Hermann von der Hardt*, Acta Conc. Constant. T. iii. p. 338, ss. Gieseler, Church History, ii. p. 32, § 151. The approbation of Hus was given later. Comp. De Sanguine Christi sub Specie vini a Laicis sumendo, quæstio M. Joannis Hus, quam Constantiæ conscripsit priusquam in carcerem conjiceretur, in Joannis Hus Historia et Monument. Norimb. 1558, T. i. fol. xlii. ss., *loc. cit.* iii. 431, *sq.*

[7] Sess. xiii. (A. D. 1415, June 15th) see in *Herm. von der Hardt*, Tom. iii. Col. 646, ss., quoted by Gieseler, l. c. p. 382, note 6, and *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 266: Firmissime credendum et nullatenus dubitandum, integrum corpus Christi et sanguinem tam sub specie panis quam sub specie vini veraciter contineri.

[8] Mansi T. xxx. Col. 695: Sancta vero mater ecclesia, suadentibus causis rationabilibus, facultatem communicandi populum sub utraque specie potest concedere et elargiri.—Nevertheless the council adhered to the earlier canon: Nullatenus ambigendum est, quod non sub specie panis caro tantum, nec sub specie vini sanguis tantum, sed sub qualibet specie est integer totus Christus, etc.; compare also Sess. xxx. (A. D. 1437, Dec. 23d) in Mansi xxix. Col. 158. *Gieseler*, l. c. p. 441. *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, pp. 267, 268.

§ 196.

DISSENTING OPINIONS.

After the doctrine of transubstantiation had been thus established, it was only now and then that a few individuals ventured to dissent from it, or, at least, to modify the commonly received notion. Thus in the twelfth century, *Rupert of Duytz* (Rupertus Tuitiensis), judging from some passages in his works, supposed that the body of Christ is united in a wondrous way with the bread, without any disturbance of the sensible elements.[1] *John of Paris* (Johannes Pungens-asinum) narrowed the notion of Rupert into the scholastic idea of *impanation*, according to which the corporeitas panis (paneitas) forms a union with the corporeitas Christi—an idea which would readily work upon the fancy in a more repulsive way than the more daring doctrine of transubstantiation.[2] *William Occam* also inferred the co-existence of Christ's body *with* the accidents, from the nominalistic theory about the quantity of things, and thus partly prepared the way for the later Lutheran view.[3] Similar opinions were taught by *Durandus de Sancto Porciano*.[4] On the other hand, *Wycliffe* combated the doctrine of transubstantiation, as well as that of impanation, with acute polemics.[5] His views were probably adopted by *Jerome of Prague*, while *Hus* expressed himself in accord with the orthodox doctrine of the Church.[6] *John Wessel* attached particular importance to spiritual participation in the Lord's Supper, and asserted that none but *believers* can

partake of the body of Christ. Though he retained the idea of a sacrifice, allied to the Catholic view, he applied it mystically to the spiritual priesthood.[1]

[1] "*Concerning Rupert of Duytz, it is difficult to state his opinion in precise terms, inasmuch as he expressed himself at different times in different ways.*" *Klee*, Dogmengeschichte, p. 202. But compare his Commentary in Exod. Lib. ii. c. 10: Sicut naturam humanam non destruxit, cum illam operatione sua ex utero Virginis Deus Verbo in unitatem personæ conjunxit, sic substantiam panis et vini, secundum exteriorem speciem quinque sensibus subactam, non mutat aut destruit, cum eidem Verbo in unitatem corporis ejusdem quod in cruce pependit, et sanguinis ejusdem quem de latere suo fudit, ista conjungit. Item quomodo Verbum a summo demissum caro factum est, non mutatum in carnem, sed *assumendo* carnem, sic panis et vinum, utrumque ab imo sublevatum, fit corpus Christi et sanguis, non mutatum in carnis saporem sive in sanguinis horrorem, sed assumendo invisibiliter utriusque, divinæ scilicet et humanæ, quæ in Christo est, immortalis substantiæ veritatem.—De div. Off. ii. 2: Unus idemque Deus sursum est in carne, hic *in pane*. He called the bread, Deifer panis.—Panem *cum* sua carne, vinum *cum* suo jungebat sanguine. But he also spoke of the bread and wine being converted and transformed into the body and blood of Christ. Compare the passages quoted by *Klee*, l. c. [Panis et vinum in verum corpus et sanguinem Domini transferuntur; Div. Offic. ii. 2. Cum igitur vino verbum crucis et passionis accedit, quæ ratio vetat, ut non idem sanguis, qui pro multis in remissionem peccatorum fusus est, debeat credi?.... Non percipiens ea, quæ sunt Dei, videlicet, quia nec panis, nec vinum, aliquid de exteriori specie mutavit, idcirco sapere non potes, nec vis, quod vere factum sit corpus et sanguis Domini: in Johan. vi. On *Rupert*, comp. *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 531. On *Malachias*, abp. of Armagh, see ibid. 532.]

[2] He died A. D. 1306. He wrote: Determinatio de Modo existendi Corpus Christi in Sacramento Altaris alio quam sit ille quem tenet Ecclesia; this work was published Lond. 1686, 8. Comp. *Cas. Oudinus*, Dissertatio de Doctrina et Scriptis Jo. Parisiensis, in Comment. de Scriptt. Eccles. T. iii. Col. 634, ss. *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. xxviii. p. 70, ss. *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 256–58.*

[3] It is of special importance that he acknowledged the impossibility of proving the doctrine of transubstantiation from Scripture (Quodl. iv. Qu. 35). He developed his own views in his Tractatus de Sacramento Altaris, and elsewhere; the passages are collected by *Rettberg* (Occam und Luther, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1839, part 1). Though Occam retained the orthodox doctrine of the accidents (§ 193, note 6), he could not attach any distinct meaning to the notion that the substance of the elements had vanished, because he was still obliged to conceive of the body of Christ and the bread

* As early as the middle of the thirteenth century several professors in the University of Paris had been charged with holding incorrect opinions concerning the Lord's Supper; see the letter addressed to Pope Clement IV. in Bulæus, vol. iii. pp. 372, 373:....Esse Parisiis celebrem opinionem tunc temporis de mysterio Eucharistiæ, qua contendebatur, corpus Christi non esse vere in altari sed sicut signatum sub signis.

as being in *one and the same* place. Thus we may "*suppose the real theory of Occam to have been this, that the body of Christ is contained in the host in the same manner in which soul and body together occupy one and the same space; and as the soul exists wholly in every member, so Christ exists wholly in every single host:*" *Rettberg*, p. 93. Occam carried out his notion of the ubiquity of the body of Christ in the most paradoxical manner. The stone thrown into the air, is, in its transit, in the same place where the body of Christ is, etc. This ubiquity, however, is not the foundation, but the consequence, of his doctrine. See *Rettberg*, p. 96.—The systems of Occam and of Luther are compared with each other, ibid. p. 123, ss.

[4] See *Cramer*, vii. pp. 804, 805, who says, "*none of the scholastics entertained views more nearly allied to those of Luther than Durandus.*" He did not directly oppose transubstantiation, but he conceded that there were other possible ways in which Christ might be present, and particularly this, that the substance of the bread might remain, and the substance of the body of Christ be united with it. The *hoc est* might mean the same as—contentum sub hoc est. He distinguished between the matter and the form; the matter of the bread, he says, exists under the form of the body of Christ.

[5] Trialogus Lib. iv. c. 2–10, *e. g.* c. 6, p. 127 (alias, p. cix.): Inter omnes hæreses, quæ unquam pullularunt in ecclesia sancta Dei, non fuit nefandior, quam hæresis ponens accidens sine subjecto esse hoc venerabile sacramentum. He also opposed the doctrine of impanation, c. 8: Sum certus quod sententia ista impanationis est impossibilis atque hæretica. He could not endure the thought, that in that case the *baker* would prepare the body of Christ, instead of the priest!—According to Wycliffe, Christ is not present in the bread realiter, sed habitudinaliter, secundum similitudinem. In illustration of his views, he also referred to mirrors, in which the *one* countenance of Christ is reflected in various ways to the eyes of the devout. The conversio which takes place, is a change from the inferior to the superior (this was the ancient opinion, which was also adopted by Berengar). He distinguished (in his confession in presence of the Duke of Lancaster) a—triplex modus essendi corpus Christi in hostia consecrata: 1. Modus virtualis, quo benefacit per totum suum dominium secundum bona naturæ vel gratiæ; 2. Modus spiritualis, quo corpus Christi est in eucharistia et sanctis per Spiritum Sanctum; 3. Modus sacramentalis, quo corpus Christi *singulariter* est in hostia consecrata. On the other hand, Christ is only in heaven, substantionaliter, corporaliter, dimensionaliter. Of like import are the following three, of the 10 Conclusiones Hæreticæ, which were condemned by the London Council of 1382 (*Mansi*, xxvii. 691): 1. Quod substantia panis materialis et vini maneat post consecrationem; 2. Quod accidentia non maneant sine subjecto; 3. Quod Christus non sit in sacramento altaris identice, vere et realiter. Comp. *Ebrard*, i. 501. *Schröckh*, xxxiv. 501, *sq.* [*Vaughan's* Life of Wycliffe.]

[6] Jerome of Prague at least was charged by the Council of Constance with holding such opinions as follows: Quod panis non transubstantiabatur in corpus Christi, nec *est* corpus Christi in sacramento præsentialiter et corporaliter, sed ut signatum in signo. Item, quod in hostia sive sacramento altaris non est vere Christus.—Christus passus est in cruce, sed hostia altaris

nunquam est passa neque patitur; ergo in hostia in sacramento altaris non est Christus.—Mures non possunt comedere Christum; sed mures possunt hostiam consecratam comedere: ergo hostia in sacramento altaris non est Christus; see *Hermann von der Hardt*, T. iv. P. viii. p. 646.—On the other hand *Poggi* (Ep. ad Aretin.) gives the following relation: Cum rogaretur, quid sentiret de sacramento, inquit: Antea panem, postea vero Christi corpus, et reliqua secundum fidem. Tum quidam: Ajunt te dixisse, post consecrationem remanere panem. Tum ille: Apud pistorem, inquit, panis remanet; see *Klee*, Dogmengesch. ii. p. 205, note 7.—*Hus* did not oppose the doctrine of the church in decided terms; he only endeavored to justify himself on the point, that he believed in the real presence of the body of Christ, without entering into any further explanation of the modus; see his Tractatus de Corpore Christi in the above Histor. et Monum. fol. cxxiii. ss. *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 260.

[7] See *Ullmann*, p. 328–340 (where extracts are given from *Wessel's* treatises: De Oratione VIII., de Sacram. Eucharistiæ, especially c. 10, 24, 26, 27; Scal. Medit. Exempl. i. ii. iii.) In his opinion the Lord's Supper is the *realization and appropriation of the love of Christ;* but he is not aware of any essential difference between the presence and appropriation of Christ in the Lord's Supper and that of which believers are conscious *without* the sacrament. The *spiritual* participation of the body of Christ is the principal thing, not the *sacramental*. The sacramental act (the sacrifice of the mass) can be performed by none but the priest; the inward communion with Christ may be renewed by every Christian.

§ 197.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

The use of unleavened bread at the commemoration of Christ's death, which had been introduced into the Latin Church from the ninth century,[1] gave rise to a controversy with the Greek Church, in the course of which the latter went so far as to charge the former with the corruption of pure religion.[2] As regards the doctrine of the sacrament itself, the Greek theologians agreed in the main with the divines of the Western Church, so far as this, that some of them propounded the doctrine of consubstantiation,[3] while others taught that of transubstantiation,[4] but without inferring from it all the consequences which we find in the writings of the scholastics. The Greek Church also preserved the ancient custom of administering the Lord's Supper to the laity sub utraque forma.[5]

[1] On this point see *Neander*, Church Hist. iii. 584. The hosts, properly so called (*i. e.*, the consecrated wafers), did not come into use till later, and, according to some writers, not till the second half of the twelfth century. Compare *J. A. Schmidt*, de Oblatis Eucharisticis, quæ Hostiæ vocari solent. Ed. 2. Helmst. 1733–4. *Augusti* viii. p. 375, ss.

[2] This was done by *Michael Cerularius*, patriarch of Constantinople, and *Leo of Acrida* with him, in a letter addressed to John, Bishop of Trani, in Apulia (in *Baronius* Annals, ad ann. 1053, No. 22, and Canisius Lect. Antt. ed. Basnage, T. iii. P. 1, p. 281). He derived, strangely enough, the noun ἄρτος from the verb ἄιρω, and appealed, in support of his theory, to Matt. xxvi. 17, 18, 20, 26–28, as well as to Matt. v. 13, and xiii. 33 (the three measures of meal are, in his opinion, an image of the Trinity!)— Division into Azymites and Prozymites (Fermentarii). Vain attempts of the Emperor, Constantine Monomachus, and the Pope Leo IX. to make peace.— The reply of *Humbert* (prim. ed. Baronius, in Append. T. xi.; Canisius, l. c. T. iii. P. 1, p. 283, ss.) is given by *Gieseler*, ii. § 42, note 5. After the controversy had been carried on for some time (*e. g.*, by Nicetas Pectoratus, and others, the Council of Florence at last granted permission to the Greeks to retain their own rite: see *Mansi*, T. xxxi. Col. 1029 and 1031. Comp. *Schröckh*, xxiv. p. 210, ss. *Neander* and *Gieseler*, l. c.

[3] *John Damascenus* quoted (De Fide Orthodoxa iv. 13,) from the writings of Cyril, Jerome, and Gregory of Nazianzum, those passages which appeared to him to carry with them the greatest weight. He decidedly rejected the symbolical interpretation, p. 271: Οὔκ ἐστι τύπος ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ· μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου τεθεωμένον, αὐτοῦ τοῦ κυρίου εἰπόντος. Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν, οὐ τύπος τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλὰ τὸ σῶμα· καὶ οὐ τύπος τοῦ αἵματος, ἀλλὰ τὸ αἷμα. (Compare John vi.) He also used in illustration (applied likewise in Christology) the coal spoken of by Isaiah vi. 6: Ἄνθραξ δὲ ξύλον λιτὸν οὔκ ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἡνωμένον πυρί. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς κοινωνίας οὐκ ἄρτος λιτός ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἡνωμένος θεότητι· σῶμα δὲ ἡνωμένον θεότητι, οὐ μία φύσις ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ μία μὲν τοῦ σώματος, τῆς δὲ ἡνωμένης αὐτῷ θεότητος ἑτέρα· ὥστε τὸ συναμφότερον, οὐ μία φύσις, ἀλλὰ δύο. See p. 273, where he shows in what sense the elements may be called ἀντίτυπα (after the example of Basilides). [*Baur*, Dogmengesch. 217: In the Greek Church the development of doctrine attained in John of Damascus the point in which the old theology is summed up. He expressly declares, that the body in the Lord's Supper is the body of Christ born of the Virgin Mary: only with this difference, that the body raised to heaven does not actually descend; but it is his body, because the bread and the wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ. The Holy Ghost effects this change in a supernatural way. On *Zacharias* of Chrysopolis, see *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 531.] The views which the Greek theologians entertained with respect to the Lord's Supper, were also connected with the part which they took in the controversy concerning images; those who *opposed* the worship of images appealed to the fact, that we have an *image* of our Saviour in the Lord's Supper, which was denied by the advocates of that doctrine. Hence the decisions of the Synod of Constantinople (A. D. 754), and of the second Council of Nice (A. D. 787), contradict each other: see *Mansi*, T. iii., Col. 261, ss. 265, and *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 222. In the decrees of the Council of Nice it is distinctly stated, that neither Christ nor his apostles had called the elements used at the Lord's Supper *images*. Comp. *Rückert*, Das Abendmahl, 441, *sq.* *Gieseler*, Dogmengesch. 533. [Constantinople declared the bread and

wine to be *τὴν ἀληθῆ τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰκόνα*; Nice said it was not an *εἰκών*, but the body and blood itself, *αὐτὸ σῶμα καὶ αὐτὸ αἷμα*.]

[4] Thus the expressions *μεταποιεῖσθαι* and *μεταβάλλεσθαι* were employed by *Theophylact* in his comment on Matt. xxvi. 28. Compare also what *Euthymius Zigabenus* said on this passage; in *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 223. *Nicolas of Methone* made use of the same expression in his treatise quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 97 (Biblioth. PP. T. ii. Græco Latinûs; Auctuar Biblioth. Ducæan. Par. 1624, p. 274); he also there speaks of a change of the added water, into the blood of Christ. He entertained, in addition, the scholastic notion, that the bread and wine do not change their external appearance, lest men might be terrified by the sight of the real flesh and blood. The true design of the Lord's Supper he conceived to consist in the *μετουσία Χριστοῦ*. "*The beginnings of theological speculation may be traced in the theory of Nicolas, but he rested satisfied* [like the Greek theologians of the present period in general] *with mere suggestions, while the scholastics of the Western Church fully exhausted such subjects.*" Ullmann.

[5] See *Augusti*, Archæologie, vol. viii. p. 398. On the question whether it was sufficient to administer *only* wine at the communion of children, see ibidem.*

§ 198.

THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE.

The doctrine of penance, which is properly speaking implied in the *ordo salutis*, presupposes the sacrament of baptism. In the scholastic system it found its place among the sacraments.[1] Though it is only by a most unnatural interpretation that this sacrament can be proved to possess a visible sign, both *Peter Lombard* and *Thomas Aquinas* endeavored to show that it had the matter, as well as the form, of a sacrament, and, as far as possible, to distinguish the one from the other.[2] The scholastics taught that penance is composed of three parts: *contritio cordis* (in distinction from attritio), *confessio oris*, and *satisfactio operis*.[3] Pious minds took offence, not so much at the formal error of regarding penance as a sacrament, as at the lax, and merely external theory of penance in general. Thus the Waldenses, while formally adopting the threefold division of penance, rejected the mechanical ecclesiastical practice in the matter.[4] *John Wessel* found fault, not only with the threefold division of penance, but also with the definitions of its

* Concerning the communion of children, which ceased to be practised from the twelfth century, see *Zorn*, Historia Eucharistiæ Infantium. Berol. 1736, 8. *Gieseler*, Dogmengesch. 542. [The custom was abolished for fear of profanation. It had been administered to children, following Augustine's interpretation of John vi. 54, because communion thought was necessary to salvation. But Fulgentius of Ruspe suggested, that in baptism children were incorporated into Christ, and so partook of his flesh and blood.]

component parts.[5] *Gerson* and others opposed the sale of indulgences.[6] *Wycliffe* attacked auricular confession.[7] But the discussion of these points belongs more properly to the history of the Church, and of ethics, than to that of doctrines.[8]

[1] The earlier custom of bringing penance into connection with *baptism* (by making a distinction between sins committed *before* and *after* baptism—by the notion of a baptism of tears—by calling it the second plank after shipwreck, etc.) led the scholastics to enumerate penance among the sacraments. Comp. *Peter Lombard*, Sent. iv. Dist. 14. A. *Thomas Aquinas*, P. iii. Qu. 86, Art. 4. *Klee*, Dogmengesch. ii. p. 326, ss.

[2] *Peter Lombard* observed (Dist. 22, C.) that some theologians regarded the external performance of the works of penance, which is perceptible by our bodily senses, as the *signum*. The external works of penance are the signs of *inward* penance, as the bread and wine used in the Lord's Supper are the signs of the body and blood of Christ which are contained in the accidents. *Thomas Aquinas*, also conceived (Qu. 84, Art. 1,) the *res sacramenti* to consist in *internal* penance, of which the *external* is only the sign. (Every outward act might in that sense be called a sacrament!) In the second article, he further distinguished between materia and forma. The materia of penance are the sins which are to be removed, the form consists in the words of the priest: Absolvo te. Compare the passages quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, pp. 276, 277. [The *proximate matter* of the sacrament consists in the acts of the penitent—the *remote matter* consists in the *sins*, non acceptanda, sed detestenda et destruanda. The *form* consists in what is done by the priest. Cum autem sacramenta novæ legis efficiunt quod figurant.... oportet quod forma sacramenti significet *id quod in sacramento agitur proportionaliter materiæ sacramenti*.... But as the sacrament is not in the consecration or use of anything, but in the *removal* of sin, the *form* consists in the formula of absolution.]

[3] This distinction was made by Hildebert of Tours (who referred it to Chrysostom and Augustine), see his Sermo iv. in Quadrag. (Opp. col. 324); Sermo xv. col. 733; quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 274; and *Peter Lombard*, Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 16, Litt. A.: In perfectione autem pœnitentiæ tria observanda sunt, scilicet *compunctio cordis*, *confessio oris*, *satisfactio operis*..... Hæc est fructifera pœnitentia, ut, sicut tribus modis deum offendimus, scilicet corde, ore et opere, ita tribus modis satisfaciamus..... Huic ergo triplici morti triplici remedio occurritur, *contritione*, *confessione*, *satisfactione*. Conc. Florent. 1439 (under Pope Eugen IV.) in *Mansi* xxxi. Col. 1057; *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 284: Quartum Sacramentum est pœnitentiæ, cujus quasi materia sunt actus pœnitentis, qui in tres distinguuntur partes. Quarum prima est cordis contritio, ad quam pertinet ut doleat de peccato commisso cum proposito non peccandi de cætero. Secunda est oris confessio, ad quam pertinet ut peccator omnia peccata, quorum memoriam habet, suo sacerdoti confiteatur integraliter. Tertia est satisfactio pro peccatis secundum arbitrium sacerdotis, quæ quidem præcique fit per orationem, jejunium et eleemosynam. Forma hujus Sacramenti sunt verba absolutionis, quæ sacerdos profert cum dicit: Ego te absolvo, etc. Ministeı

hujus sacramenti est sacerdos, habens auctoritatem absolvendi vel ordinariam, vel ex commissione superioris. Effectus hujus sacramenti est absolutio a peccatis.—On the difference between contritio and attritio, see *Alexander of Hales*, P. 4, Qu. 74, membr. 1: Timor servilis principium est attritionis, timor initialis (*i. e.* that with which the life of sanctification begins)* principium est contritionis.....Item, contritio est a gratia gratum faciente, attritio a gratia gratis data. Comp. *Thom. Aquinas*, Qu. 1, Art. 2; *Bonaventura* in Lib. iv. Dist. 17, P. 1, Art. 2, Qu. 3.—[*Attritio* proceeds from fear, and not from love to God: contritio is the real sorrow for sin, proceeding from love; attritio is the terminus a quo, contritio is the terminus ad quem. Contritio is necessary to forgiveness. But a special satisfaction to justice is required for past sins; hence penance involves *opera pœnalia*. The church prescribes these, and they deliver from the severer punishments of the purgatorial fire.] The necessity of confessio oris (*i. e.* that it was necessary to confess our sins not only to God, but also to the *priest*) was asserted by *Thomas Aquinas*, in Supplem. tertiæ Part. Quæst. 8, Art. 1; *Peter Lombard*, expressed himself more indefinitely on this point, Sent. iv. Dist. 17, Litt. B.—The ecclesiastical institution of *auricular confession* was established by the fourth Council of the Lateran (under Pope Innocent III.) Can. xxi. in Decretis Greg. L. v. Tit. 38, C. 12: Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, omnia sua solus peccata confiteatur fideliter, saltem semel in anno, proprio sacerdoti,† et injunctam sibi pœnitentiam studeat pro viribus adimplere, etc. *Gieseler*, ii. § 81, note 5; *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 282. The satisfactio operis consisted in fastings, prayers, alms, pilgrimages, mortifications, etc. *Thomas Aquinas*, l. c. Qu. 15, Art. 3 (quoted by *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 279.) The practice of imposing fines instead of bodily punishments, gave rise to the sale of indulgences.

[4] The Waldenses even attempted to vindicate this threefold division by allegorizing. The spices with which the women went to anoint the body of the Lord on Easter morning, were myrrh, aloes and balsam. From these three costly spices is prepared that spiritual ointment, which is called penance. See *Herzog*, Die Romanischen Waldenser. But the Waldenses still differed from the Catholic Church in this, that confession was not necessarily to be made to a priest of that church, and that they went beyond the external works of penance to the internal penitence of the heart.

[5] De Sacramento Pœnitentiæ, p. 782: Est enim actus *mentis* pœnitentia sicut peccatum: utrumque enim *voluntatis*. Et sicut peccatum voluntatis tantum est, ita pœnitentia solius est voluntatis. For further particulars, see *Ullmann*, p. 340, ss.

* On this account, others (such as *Thomas* and *Bonaventura*) also called the contritio, timor filialis, as opposed to the timor servilis.

† In the absence of a priest it was permitted to confess to a layman; but this led to the question as to how far the sacrament was complete in such a case? See *Thom. Aquinas*, in Suppl. Qu. 8, Art. 2: on the other side, *Bonaventura* P iii. ad Expos. text. dub. l. p. 229. *Duns Scotus*, in lib. iv. Dist. 17, Qu. 1.—The sects of the middle ages, even the Flagellantes, preferred confession to a layman. Comp. *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, pp. 283, 284. *Gieseler*, ii. 197. *Klee*, Dogmengesch ii. p. 252, ss.

[2] Epistola de Indulgentiis (Opp. T. ii.) c. 3–5, and c. 9.
[3] Trialog. libr. iv. c. 32.
See *Gieseler*, Church Hist. vol. ii. passim.

§ 199.

THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

(Sacramentum Unctionis Extremæ, Unctionis Infirmorum.)

The apostolic injunction respecting the sick, James v. 14 (comp. Mark vi. 13), which probably had a symbolical and religious significance, as well as a medicinal and therapeutic,[1] gave rise to the institution of a new sacrament, which came into general use from the ninth century, and could be administered only in the dying hour.[2] But various opinions obtained on the question, whether it was proper to repeat the administration of the sacrament in the case of a dying person who had received it on a former occasion, but who had recovered, and been restored to life; or, whether it was sufficient to have administered it once? The Church did not ascribe a character indelebilis to this sacrament.[3] Its sign is the consecrated oil, its essence consists in the forgiveness of sin, and partly also in the alleviation of bodily sufferings.[4]

[1] See the commentators on this passage; the *Venerable Bede*, Opp. T. v. Col. 693; and on Mark vi. 13, ibid. Col. 132 (quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by Von Cölln, p. 297. [*Bede* on Mark vi. 13: Unde patet ab ipsis Apostolis hunc sanctum Ecclesiæ morem esse traditum, ut energumeni, vel alii quilibet ægroti, unguantur oleo pontificali benedictione consecrato.] *Innocent I.* Ep. 21, ad Decentium Ep. Eugubinum (written about the year 416) Cap. 8; ibid. p. 298. [Innocent III.: Quod non est dubium de fidelibus ægrotantibus accipi vel intelligi debere, qui sancto oleo chrismatis perungi possunt: quod ab Episcopo confectum, non solum sacerdotibus, sed omnibus uti Christianis licet in sua, aut in suorum necessitate ungendum.]

[2] Concil. Regiaticinum (A. D. 850) Canon 8: in *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 298. [This Council says of it: Magnum sane ac valde appetendum mysterium, per quod, si fideliter poscitur, et remittuntur [peccata], et consequenter corporalis salus restituitur.]—Among the scholastics *Hugo of St. Victor* was the first who spoke of extreme unction as a sacrament; de Sacram. ii. P. xv.; comp. Summa Sent. Tract. vi. c. 15 (*Liebner*, p. 481). The doctrine of extreme unction formed, in his system, the transition to eschatology.—Peter Lombard, Sent. iv. Dist. 23, mentioned three different kinds of consecrated oil (χρίσματα): 1. That with which priests and kings are anointed (on the head), or those who are confirmed (upon the forehead). 2. That with which catechumens and newly baptized persons are anointed (upon the chest, and between the shoulders). 3. The unctio infirmorum

(which may be performed on various parts of the body. Compare note 4.)* He also distinguished between the sacramentum, and the res sacramenti. B: Sacramentum est ipsa unctio exterior, res sacramenti unctio interior, quæ peccatorum remissione et virtutum ampliatione perficitur. Et si ex contemtu vel negligentia hoc prætermittitur, periculosum est et damnabile.

[3] *Ivo of Chartres* (Ep. 225) ad Radulfum, and *Geoffrey of Vendome* (who lived about the year 1110), Opusculum de Iteratione Sacramenti (in Sermondi Opp. T. iii.), *opposed* the repetition of extreme unction (Comp. *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 299): *Peter Lombard* pronounced in *favor* of it, l. c. Lit. C. [*Lombard* here follows Hugo St. Victor almost verbally: Sacramentum unctionis spiritualis est quædam medicina, corporis et animæ languores mitigans et sanans: nam oleum membra dolentia sanat. Itaque oleum ad utrumque curandum prodest. Si morbus non revertitur, medicina non iteretur; si autem morbus non potest cohiberi, quare deberet medicina prohiberi? . . . . Quare ergo negatur quod unctionis sacramentum super infirmum *iterari possit* ad reparandam sæpius sanitatem, et ad impetrandam sæpius peccatorum remissionem.]—On the controversy concerning this point, which arose on the occasion of the death of Pope Pius II., see above § 190, note 6.—The opinion also obtained during the middle ages, that extreme unction does away with all the relations in which man stands to the present world; the person who had received extreme unction immediately renounced all kinds of meat, and the continuance of matrimony. Bishops, however, as well as councils, *e. g.* the Concil. of Worcester (A. D. 1240), combated this notion. See *Klee*, ii. p. 272.

[4] Comp. the opinion of *Peter Lombard*, note 2, and *Hugo of St. Victor*, De Sacram. Fid. Lib. ii. P. xv. c. 2: Duplici ex causa sacramentum hoc institutum, et ad peccatorum scilicet remissionem, et ad corporalis infirmitatis allevationem. Comp. *Thomas Aquinas*, P. iii. in Supplem. Qu. 30, Art. 1. —Decret. Eugenii IV. in Conc. Florent. a. 1439 (*Mansi*, T. xxxi. Col. 1058): Quintum Sacramentum est extrema unctio. Cujus materia est oleum olivæ per episcopum benedictum. Hoc sacramentum nisi infirmo, de cujus morte timetur, dari non debet. Qui in his locis ungendus est: in oculis propter visum, in auribus propter auditum, in naribus propter oderatum, in ore propter gustum vel locutionem, in manibus propter tactum, in pedibus propter gressum, in renibus propter delectationem ibidem vigentem. Forma hujus sacramenti est hæc: per istam unctionem et suam piissimam misericordiam, quicquid peccasti per visum, etc. . . . . et similiter in aliis membris. Minister hujus sacramenti est sacerdos. Effectus vero est mentis sanatio, et, in quantum autem expedit, ipsius etiam corporis (he appeals to Jam. v. 14).

* On the further significance of consecrated oil, see *Thom. Aquinas*, Supplem. Quæst. xxiv. Art. iv.—*Klee*, ii. pp. 268, 269.

§ 200.

THE SACRAMENT OF ORDERS.

(Sacramentum Ordinis.)

This sacrament is intimately connected with the doctrine of the Church, and with the distinction made between the laity and the clergy. It is that sacrament by which men are fitted to administer the other sacraments.[1] Accordingly, its essence lies in the ecclesiastical power which it communicates.[2] None but bishops can ordain,[3] and only baptised and grown-up males can receive ordination.[4] Theologians differed in their opinions respecting the validity of ordination by heretical bishops.[5] Further regulations (concerning ordines majores et minores, etc.) belong to the canon law.[6] This sacrament has a character indelebilis.[7]

[1] *Thomas Aquinas*, Pars iii., Supplem. Qu. 34, Art. 3: Propter Ordinem fit homo dispensator aliorum sacramentorum, ergo Ordo habet magis rationem, quod sit sacramentum, quam alia.—*Raimund of Sabunde* says, that the administrators to the sacraments stand in the same relation to the sacred acts in which parents stand to the act of generation. They dispense the external signs, God effects the inward grace; as parents beget the body, but God creates the soul (the creatianist view); see *Matzke*, Raimund von Sabunde, p. 101.

[2] The statements are very vacillating as to what really constitutes the material (in distinction from the formal) part of ordination. As regards the external sign of ordination, there was a considerable difference of opinion. The earlier Church regarded the laying on of hands (*χειροτονία*) as having a higher, a magical virtue, while the later theologians attached no great importance to it; comp. *Klee*, ii. pp. 280, 281. [*Klee*, *loc. cit.*, says: The ancient church, in accordance with the Scriptures, made the laying on of hands to be the *matter* of the ordination; by this is effected the elevation and consecration to the episcopate, the presbyterate and the diaconate. Anointing is also very early mentioned in the inauguration of bishops and priests (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. x. 4; Greg. Naz. Orat. IV.; Greg. Nyss. Virg. cap. xxiv.; Leo, often); and the laying the Gospels on the head, at the ordination of bishops (Hippolytus, De Chrism. cap. 1: Chrysost. Homil. quod Veteris Test. Unus Legislator, in Photii Cod. cclxxvii.)] The consecrated oil also was only occasionally mentioned. *Thomas Aquinas*, l. c. Art. 5, candidly avowed, that while the efficacy of the other sacraments consisted in the matter, quod divinam virtutem et significat et continet, it depended, in the present case, on the person who administered the sacrament, and that it was transmitted by him to the person to be ordained. Therefore, in his view, *the act of ordination* is the material,—not the symbols, which are used at its administration. Nevertheless, it is said in the Decret. Eugenii IV. in Conc. Florent. a. 1439, l. c. col. 1058: Sextum Sacramentum est

Ordinis, cujus materia est illud, per cujus traditionem confertur Ordo: sicut Presbyteratus traditur per calicis cum vino et patenæ cum pane porrectionem; Diaconatus vero per libri Evangeliorum dationem; Subdiaconatus vero per calicis vacui cum patena vacua superposita traditionem, et similiter de aliis per rerum ad ministeria sua pertinentium assignationem. Forma sacerdotii talis est: Accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium in ecclesia pro vivis et mortuis, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Et sic de aliorum ordinum formis, prout in pontificali romano late continetur. Compare also *Peter Lombard*, Lib. iv. Dist. 24. He calls (Lit. B.) the tonsure (corona) the signaculum, quo signantur in partem sortis ministerii divini... Denudatio capitis est revelatio mentis [God grant it!]. Clericus enim secretorum Dei non ignarus esse debet. Tondentur etiam capilli usque ad revelationem sensuum, scilicet oculorum et aurium, ut vitia in corde et opere pullulantia doceantur præcidenda, ne ad audiendum et intelligendum verbum Dei præpediatur mens, pro quo servato reddetur in excelsis corona.

[3] Decret. Eug. IV. loc. cit.: Ordinarius minister hujus sacramenti est Episcopus. Comp. *Thom. Aqu.*, Qu. 38, Art. 1.

[4] This is self-evident. Concerning the age at which persons may be ordained, the following regulations were made: ut Subdiaconus non ordinetur ante quatuordecim annos, nec Diaconus ante viginti quinque, nec Presbyter ante triginta. Deinde, si dignus fuerit, ad episcopatum eligi potest; see *Peter Lombard*, loc. cit. lit. I. The priests were to be thirty years old, because Christ (according to Luke iii.) commenced his public ministry at the age of thirty years.

[5] The views of *Peter Lombard* on this point were still unsettled, Sent. iv. Dist. 25, De ordinatis ab hæreticis. Thomas Aquinas P. iii., in Supplem. Dist. 38, Art. 2, gave it as his final opinion, quod (hæretici) vera sacramenta conferunt, sed cum eis gratiam non dant, non propter inefficaciam sacramentorum, sed propter peccata recipientium ab eis sacramenta contra prohibitionem ecclesiæ. As the present question was analogous to that concerning the baptism of heretics, it was to be decided on the same principles; see *Auxilius*, quoted by *Klee*, ii. p. 282. [Si enim non perdit baptizatus baptismum, etiam eliminatus ab ecclesia, quo facto perdit sacratus licet excommunicatus sacramentum suæ impositionis posse nisi ad tempus obtemperando priori, ut paulo post absolutus iterum fungatur officio, sicut et baptizatus ecclesiæ ingressum? Est igitur posse, sed non in actu. *Auxilius*, Libell. super Caus. et Negot. Formosi Papæ.]

[6] *Peter Lombard*, loc. cit. The seven classes of Holy Orders are enumerated in the following succession, commencing with the lowest: Ostiarii, Lectores, Exorcistæ, Acoluthi—Subdiaconi, Diaconi, Presbyteri.

[7] *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 25, Art. 2, Qu. 37, Art. 5, quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 303. [To the objection, that the character conferred was not indelible, because the person could return to the laity, *Aquinas* replied: Quantumcunque homo ad laicatum se transferat, semper tamen manet in eo character. Quod patet ex hoc quod, si ad clericatum revertatur, non iterum Ordinem quem habuerat suscipit.]

§ 201.

THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY.

(Sacramentum matrimonii conjugii.)

One of the strange contradictions found in the general views of the Catholic Church during the middle ages, was, that, while on the one hand single life was thought to be a special virtue, on the other hand matrimony was numbered among the sacraments.[1] Much ingenuity was indeed required to show the true signs of a sacrament in matrimony in the concrete, as they were specified by the Church itself in the abstract. In the absence of a visible material element, *matrimony itself* was regarded as a type of the union of Christ with the Church (according to Eph. v. 32), and the word μυστήριον, translated sacramentum, as the Vulgate has it.[2] That it was a divine institution was more easily shown; in fact, as regards antiquity, matrimony occupied the first place among the sacraments, since it was instituted in Paradise.[3] Though it has not a character indelebilis, it is indissoluble as a sacrament, even where bodily separation may have taken place.[4] Further regulations concerning conjugal duties, prohibited relationships, etc., belong partly to the canon law, partly to ethics.[5] According to the laws of the Western Church, the two sacraments of matrimony and of holy orders so exclude each other, that he who receives the one must, as a general rule, renounce the other.[6]

[1] *Peter Lombard*, loc. cit. Dist. xxvi. F. *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 53, Art. 3. —Some scholastics, however, restricted the idea of sacrament; thus Durandus, Sent. iv. Dist. 26, Qu. 3. No. 8, quoted by *Klee*, Dogmengesch. ii. p. 302. (Cramer, vii. p. 807): Quod matrimonium non est sacramentum stricte et proprie dictum, sicut alia sacramenta novæ legis. On the opinions of *Abelard* and *Peter John Oliva*, see ibidem.—[*Abelard*, Theol. Christ. cap. xxxi.: Quod (conjugium) quidem sacramentum est, sed non confert aliquod donum, sicut cætera faciunt, sed tamen mali remedium est, datur enim propter incontinentiam refrænandam, unde magis ad indulgentiam. Peter Oliva held the same view, but retracted.]—That which constitutes the sacrament of matrimony is not the performance of the ceremony by the priest, but the consensus of husband and wife. *Peter Lombard*, Dist. xxvii. C. Respecting particular decrees of popes and councils, see *Klee*, ii. p. 305. [The scholastics generally held, that the will of the contracting parties constitutes the marriage; they complete the sacrament; secret marriages, though forbidden, are valid. In none of the ancient rituals is there a sacramental form of marriage to be spoken by the priests.]

[2] *Peter Lombard*, loc. cit.... Ut enim inter conjuges conjunctio est secundum consensum animorum, et secundum permixtionem corporum: sic

Ecclesia Christo copulatur voluntate et natura, qua idem vult cum eo et ipse formam sumsit de natura hominis. Copulata est ergo sponsa sponso spiritualiter et corporaliter, *i. e.* charitate ac conformitate naturæ. Hujus utriusque copulæ figura est in conjugio. Consensus enim conjugum copulam spiritualem Christi et ecclesiæ, quæ fit per charitatem, significat. Commixtio vero sexuum illam significat, quæ fit per naturæ conformitatem.—Eugen. IV. in Conc. Florent. loc. cit. col. 1058, s.: Septimum est sacramentum Matrimonii, quod est signum conjunctionis Christi et Ecclesiæ secundum Apostolum dicentem (Eph. v. 31): *Sacramentum hoc*, etc.

[3] Compare above § 190, note 1. A distinction, however, should be made —viz. *prior* to the fall matrimony was instituted, ad officium, *posterior* to it, ad remedium (propter illicitum motum devitandum); see *Peter Lombard*, loc. cit. Dist. xvi. B. *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 42, Art. 2, Conclus.

[4] *Peter Lombard*, loc. cit. Dist. xxxi. lit. B.: Separatio autem gemina est, corporalis scilicet et sacramentalis. Corporaliter possunt separari causa fornicationis, vel ex communi consensu causa religionis, sive ad tempus sive usque in finem. Sacramentaliter vero separari non possunt dum vivunt, si legitimæ personæ sint. Manet enim vinculum conjugale inter eos, etiamsi aliis a se discedentes adhæserint.—Eugen. IV. in Conc. Florent. l. c.: Quamvis autem ex causa fornicationis liceat tori divisionem facere, non tamen aliud matrimonium contrahere fas est, cum matrimonii vinculum legitime contracti perpetuum sit.—The notions of the Greeks concerning the indissolubility of matrimony were less rigid; the Nestorians alone form an exception; see *Klee*, ii. pp. 297, 298. [*Assemanus*, Diss. de Nestorian. in Bib. Orient. Tom. iii. Pars. iii. p. 326.]

[5] The theologians of the time treated of all those regulations in their works on dogmatic theology. *Peter Lombard* had set them an example, Comp. Dist. xxiv.–xliii.—Many definitions of Peter Lombard, Bonaventura, and others, do not at all involve the idea of *sacrament;* such as, that matrimony is conjunctio legitima maris et fœminæ, individuam vitæ consuetudinem retinens, etc. The same may be said with regard to their statements, that the design of matrimony is the propagation of the human race, to be a safeguard against sin, etc.

[6] *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 53, Art. 3: Ordo sacer de sui ratione habet ex quadam congruentia, quod matrimonium impediri debeat, quia in sacris Ordinibus constituti sacra vasa et sacramenta tractant, et ideo decens est ut munditiam corporalem per continentiam servent. Sed quod impediat matrimonium ex constitutione ecclesiæ habet. Tamen aliter apud Latinos, quam apud Græcos. Quia apud Græcos impedit matrimonium contrahendum solum ex vi Ordinis, sed apud Latinos impedit ex vi Ordinis et ulterius ex voto continentiæ, quod est Ordinibus sacris annexum: quod etiamsi quis verbotenus non emittat, ex hoc ipso tamen, quod Ordinem suscipit secundum ritum occidentalis ecclesiæ, intelligitur emisisse. Et ideo apud Græcos et alios Orientales sacer Ordo impedit matrimonium contrahendum, non tamen matrimonii prius contracti usum: possunt enim matrimonio prius contracto uti, quamvis non possunt matrimonium denuo contrahere. Sed apud occidentalem ecclesiam impedit matrimonium et matrimonii usum, nisi forte ignorante aut contradicente uxore vir Ordinem sacrum susceperit, quia ex hoc non potest ei aliquod præ-

judicium generari. The priests, on the one hand, are excluded from the sacrament of matrimony, nor are the laity, on the other, under any necessity of observing it. Therefore matrimony is neither a sacramentum necessitatis, as baptism, penance, and the Lord's Supper, nor a sacramentum dignitatis, as Holy Orders, but a sacramentum consilii. *Alanus ab Insulus* in his Expositio (quoted by *Klee*, ii. p. 304, note.)

Protestant writers on the history of doctrines can not be expected to investigate fully the history of each separate sacrament. But this much appears to be certain, that it is exceedingly difficult, in the case of most of the so-called sacraments, to prove that they are founded upon a definite idea of sacrament, according to the canon established by the Church itself. In the case of some (such as penance, the ordination of priests, and matrimony) we have no visible element, properly speaking, which might be regarded as sacræ rei signum (as the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, or the water of baptism, or the *χρῖσμα*), unless we transpose the whole thing, and convert into the symbol that which is properly the res sacramenti. In the case of others, the divina institutio is either altogether wanting (*e. g.*, in the case of confirmation), or it can only be demonstrated by that sort of interpretation by which we may prove anything (thus in the case of extreme unction). But as these theologians were accustomed to regard the external element in the Lord's Supper as mere accidens, and thus destroyed its originally *symbolical* character, they did not think it necessary to be very precise in the case of other sacraments. And as for the divina institutio, they were to appeal not only to Scripture, but also to tradition.

SEVENTH DIVISION.

ESCHATOLOGY.

§ 202.

MILLENNARIANISM. THE APPROACHING END OF THE WORLD. ANTICHRIST.

Though Millennarianism (Chiliasm) had been suppressed by the earlier Church, it was nevertheless from time to time revived by the heretical sects of the present age. Millennarian notions were propounded in the prophecies of *Joachim*, Abbot of Flore, and the *Evangelium æternum* of the Fratricelli, which was based upon his works.[1] The dynasty of the Father and the Son was to be followed by the golden age—viz., the dynasty of the Holy Spirit.[2] On the other hand, the almost universal expectation of the approaching end of the world, which was to take place about the year 1000, was founded upon a too literal interpretation of Scripture, rather than upon Millennarian enthusiasm. A similar expectation repeatedly manifested itself at other important epochs of the middle ages.[3] It was connected with the expectation of Antichrist, concerning whom several theologians adventured various suggestions, while many of those who were enemies to the Romish hierarchy, thought that he was none other than the Pope himself.[4] This view was transmitted to the age of the Reformation.

[1] Admiranda Expositio venerabilis Abbatis Joachimi in librum Apocalypsis b. Joannis Apostoli et Evangelistæ.—Liber Concordiæ Novi ac Veteris Testamenti—Psalterium decem Chordarum—Interpretatio in Jeremiam Prophetam. Comp. *Engelhardt*, kirchenhistor. Abhandlungen, p. 1, 150. *Lücke*, Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis, p. 519.—*Gieseler*, ii. § 70, p. 433. —On the Fratricelli who originally belonged to the order of the Franciscan monks but were excommunicated in the 14th century, comp. *Giesele*r, ii. 439, iii. 119, 173. [*Friederich* on Joachim, and the commentaries on Isaiah and Jerem. in Zeitschrift f. Wiss. Theol., 1859. Communicated by *Baur*.]

[2] Compare *Engelhardt* and *Lücke*, as above. The first status lasts 5000 years (from Adam to Christ), the second lasts 1000 years, from Christ to the commencement of the last age of the world. This last age is the seventh sabbatical period of a thousand years. *Joachim* further divided the ages of

the world into forty-two generations (ætates) after the forty-two periods in the genealogy of Christ, etc.

[3] "*It was a prevailing tradition among commentators, that the period of a thousand years, spoken of in* Rev. xx., *commenced with the manifestation, or the passion of Christ, and that the establishment of the Christian Church was to be regarded as the first resurrection, and the first epoch of the kingdom of a thousand years. This interpretation, which had been adopted in the West, especially from the time of Augustine, had the advantage of precluding the fancies of millennarian enthusiasts, and accustoming the minds of Christians to a more spiritual apprehension of the Apocalypse. But the tradition of the Church had not decided whether the computation of the thousand years was to be founded upon the common system of chronology, or whether that number was to be looked upon as an apocalyptical symbol. Inasmuch as the literal interpretation of the numbers was generally adopted by the common mind, notwithstanding all allegorical conceits, the notion began to spread in the Christian world with the approach of the year* 1000—*that, in accordance with Scripture, the millennial kingdom would come to a close at the completion of the first period of a thousand years after Christ: that, further, Antichrist would then appear, and the end of the world take place.*" *Lücke*, loc. cit. pp. 514, 515. On the commotions which happened at that time in the Church, comp. *Trithemii* Chronic. Hirsaug. ad ann. 960. *Glaber Radulphus*, Hist. sui Temp. Lib. iv. c. 6 (in *Duchesne*, Scriptt. Francorum T. iv. p. 22, ss.) *Schmid*, Geschichte des Mysticismus im Mittellalter, p. 89. *Gieseler*, ii. p. 159. The crusades were also connected with millennarian expectations, see *Corrodi*, ii. p. 522, ss., *Schmid*, l. c.—When, in the course of the fourteenth century, the plague, famine, and other divine punishments, reminded men of the uncertainty of all that is earthly, and signs were seen in the heavens, it was especially the Flagellantes who announced that the end of the world was nigh at hand; the same was done by *Martin Loquis* a native of Moravia, and priest of the Taborites, see *Schröckh*, xxxiv. p. 687. [Comp. Hecker, Epidemics of Middle Ages, Lond., 1846, and *R. D. Hitchcock*, in Am. Theol. Review, i. 241, sq.]

[4] Comp. *John Damascenus* De Fide Orthod. iv. 26. Elucidarium c. 68.* It was a current opinion during the middle ages, that Antichrist would either be brought forth by a virgin, or be the offspring of a bishop and a nun. About the year 950, *Adso*, a monk in a monastery of western Franconia, wrote a treatise on Antichrist, in which he assigned a later time to his coming, and also to the end of the world (see *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. xxi. p. 243.) He did not distinctly state whom he understood by Antichrist. For a time it was thought that Mohammed was the Antichrist. He was thus designated by Pope Innocent III. (A. D. 1213.) The numeral 666 indicated the period of his dominion, which was therefore now about to come to an end.—The antichristian prophets spoken of in the book of Revelation, were thought to denote the heresy which spread, with increased rapidity, from the close of the twelfth century. On the other hand, during the strug-

* Concerning this work, which was formerly ascribed to Anselm, see *Schröckh*, xxviii. p. 427.

gles of the German emperors with the popes, it happened more than once that the former applied the title Antichrist to the latter; we find instances of this as early as the times of the Hohenstaufen. Emperor Lewis, surnamed the Bavarian, also called Pope John XXII. the *mystical* Antichrist (*Schröckh* xxxi. p. 108). The fanatical sects of the middle ages agreed, for the most part, in giving that name to the popes. Thus *Amalrich of Bena* taught: Quia Papa esset Antichristus et Roma Babylon et ipse sedet in monte Oliveti, *i. e.* in pinguedine potestatis (according to *Cæsarius* of Heisterbach), comp. *Engelhardt*, kirchenhistorische Abhandlungen, p. 256. The same was done by the Spirituales, etc., see *Engelhardt*, l. c. pp. 4, 56, 78, 88; *Lücke*, l. c. pp. 520, 521. Even *Wycliffe* agreed with them (Trialogus, quoted by Schröckh, xxxiv. p. 509), as well as his disciples, *Lewis Cobham* (ibid. p. 557), and *Janow:* Liber de Antichristo et membrorum eius anatomia (in Historia et Monumento Joh. Huss. P. i. p. 423–464, quoted by *Schröckh*, l. c. p. 572).—Most of the orthodox theologians, *e. g.*, *Thomas Aquinas*, were opposed to all literal interpretation of the Apocalypse. On the other hand, there were some, such as *Roger Bacon*, who delighted in apocalyptical interpretations, and calculations of the time of Antichrist; see his Opus Majus ed. *Jebb.* p. 169. *Lücke*, l. c. p. 522.

§ 203.

THE INFLUENCE OF MEDIÆVAL TENDENCIES AND OF CHRISTIAN ART UPON ESCHATOLOGY.

The tendency of the age manifested itself in the works of Christian art,[1] in which those subjects were preferred which had reference to the doctrine of the last things. While the hymn "*Dies iræ*,"[2] sounded the terrors of the general judgment into the ears and heart of Christendom, painters were employed in keeping alive a remembrance of the end of all things, by their representations of the dances of death, and of the general judgment;[3] and *Dante* disclosed in his *Divina Commedia* the worlds of hell, purgatory, and paradise.[4] There was an evident action and reaction between these works of imagination on the one hand, and the subtle reasonings and definitions of the scholastics on the other, so that the one may be explained by the other.

[1] Thus most of the magnificent cathedrals on the continent were built at that very time, when the end of all things was supposed to be nigh at hand; see *Gieseler*, ii. § 27, note 8.

[2] The author of it was Thomas of Cellano; see *Lisco*, Dies Iræ, Hymnus auf das Weltgericht, Berlin, 1840. 4. [See *Gieseler*, ii. 416, notes 4, 5; 506, note 3. A collection of different versions by Dr. Coles, published in New York, 1860. *Mohnike*, kirchen-und literärhist. Studien. Stralsund. 1834.]

[3] *Grüneisen*, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurtheilung der Todtentänze (im Kunstblatte zum Morgenblatt. 1830, No. 22–26,) and his Nicholas Manuel, p. 73.

[4] Dante Alighieri was born A. D. 1265, and died A. D. 1321. (As a theologian he belonged to the school of Thomas Aquinas.) There are German translations of his Divina Comedia by Streckfuss, Philalethes, Gusek, Kopisch, and others. [The Vision, or Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise, of *Dante Alighieri*. Translated by the *Rev. H. T. Cary, A.M.*, Lond., a new edit., 1847. *F. X. Wegele*, Dante's Leben, Jena, 1852. *E. Magnier*, Dante et le moyen âge, Paris, 1860. *M. Fauriel*, Dante, etc., 2, Paris, 1854. Recent Translations of D., Christ. Remembrancer, April, 1857; Westminster Review, Jan., 1861, (sixteen English versions noticed). *R. de Vericour*, Life and Times of Dante, Lond., 1858. Count *Cesare Balbo*, Life and Times of Dante, transl. by *J. F. Bunbury*, 2. 8vo., Lond., 1852. Besides the above version of Cary, there have been published in English, translations of the Commedia by C. B. Cayley, 1854; P. Bannerman (Edinburgh), 1850; J. C. Wright, 1845; H. C. Jennings; F. Pollock, 1854; E. O'Donnell, 1852; T. Brooksbank, 1854; H. Boyd, 1802; J. W. Thomas, 1850. The Inferno was translated by J. Dayman, 1843; C. A. Carlyle, 1840; T. W. Parsons, Boston, 1843; Bruce Whyte, 1859.]

§ 204.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

The resurrection of the human body, with all its component parts, was, from the time of Jerome and Augustine, regarded as the orthodox doctrine of the Catholic Church. *John Scotus Erigena* adopted the earlier notions of Origen,[1] but his views did not obtain the approbation of the Catholic Church. On the other hand, the Bogomiles, Cathari, and other heretical sects, revived the erroneous notion of the Gnostics, who, looking upon matter as the seat of sin, rejected the resurrection of the body.[2] *Moneta*, a Dominican monk, defended the ecclesiastical doctrine in opposition to the Cathari.[3] It was then further developed into particulars by the scholastics,[4] especially by *Thomas Aquinas*, with many strange conjectures respecting the nature of the resurrection-body.[5] The theologians of the Greek Church held more closely to Scripture and the received tradition of the Church.

[1] De Div. Nat. iv. 12, 13, p. 193: Omne siquidem quod in mundo ex mundo compositum incipit esse, necesse est resolvi et cum mundo interire. Necessarium erat exterius ac materiale corpus solvi in ea elementa, ex quibus assumtum est: non autem necessarium perire, quoniam ex Deo erat, manente semper interiori illo et incommutabiliter stante in suis rationibus, secundum quas cum anima et in anima et per animam et propter animam constitutum

est. Quoniam vero illius corporis materialis atque solubilis manet in anima species, non solum illo vivente, verum etiam post ejus solutionem et in elementa mundi reditum.....Est enim exterius et materiale corpus signaculum interioris, in quo forma animæ exprimitur, et per hoc forma ejus rationabiliter appellatur. Et ne me existimes duo corpora naturalia in uno homine docere: verum enim est corpus, quo connaturaliter et consubstantialiter animæ compacto homo conficitur. Illud siquidem materiale quod est superadditum, rectius vestimentum quoddam mutabile et corruptibile veri ac naturalis corporis accipitur, quam verum corpus: non enim verum est, quod semper non manet (Aug.).....Inde fit, quod semper non simpliciter, sed cum additamento aliquo ponitur corpus mortale vel corruptibile vel terrenum vel animale, ad discretionem ipsius simplicis corporis, quod primitus in homine editum est, et quod futurum est.—Compare ii. 23, p. 71 : Semel enim et simul animas nostras et corpora in Paradiso conditor creavit, corpora dico cœlestia, *spiritualia, qualia post resurrectionem futura sunt.* Tumida namque corpora, mortalia, corruptibilia, quibus nunc opprimimur, non ex natura, sed ex delicto occasionem ducere, non est dubitandum. Quod ergo naturæ ex peccato adolevit, eo profecto renovata in Christo, et in pristinum statum restituta, carebit. Non enim potest naturæ esse cœternum, quod ei adhæret propter peccatum.

[2] The Beguines are said to have asserted, quod mortuo corpore hominis solus spiritus vel anima hominis redibit ad eum, unde exivit, et cum eo sic reunietur, quod nihil remanebit, nisi quod ab æterno fuit Deus; quoted by Mosheim, pp. 257, 258, compare § 206, note 9.—On the notions of the Bogomiles, see *Engelhardt*, kirchenhistorische Abhandlungen, pp. 187, 188.

[3] Summa adv. Catharos, Lib. iv. Cap. 7, § 1.

[4] *Peter Lombard*, Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 43, ss. (he follows for the most part Augustine's Enchiridion), and *Hugo of St. Victor* de Sacram. ii. 1, 19. The former still modestly expresses himself as follows: Omnibus quæstionibus, quæ de hac re moveri solent, satisfacere non valeo.

[5] These definitions are also for the most part founded upon Augustine (comp. vol. i. § 140.) All men will die previous to the general resurrection (on account of original sin); the resurrection will probably take place towards evening, for the heavenly bodies which rule over all earthly matter must first cease to move. Sun and moon will then meet again in that point where they were probably created. The resurrection will take place suddenly in relation to the effects produced by the divine power; it will be gradual in relation to the part the angels will have in it. Thomas Aquinas denied that dust and ashes have a natural tendency to re-unite themselves to the souls to which they were united in this world (a kind of pre-established harmony), but supposed that no other matter would rise from the grave, than what existed at the moment of death. If that substance were to rise again which has been consumed during the present life, it would form a most unshapely mass.—According to Qu. 81, those who are raised from the dead, will be in the ætas juvenilis, quæ inter decrementum et incrementum constituitur. The difference of sexes will continue to exist, but without sensual appetites. All the organs of sense will still be active, with the exception of the sense of taste. It is, however, possible that even the latter

may be rendered more perfect, and fitted for adequate functions and enjoyments. Hair and nails are one of the ornaments of man, and are therefore quite as necessary as blood and other fluids. The resurrection-bodies will be exceedingly fine, and be delivered from the corpulence and heavy weight which is now so burdensome to them; nevertheless, they will be tangible, as the body of Christ could be touched after his resurrection. Their size will not increase after the resurrection, nor will they grow either thicker or thinner. To some extent they will still be dependent on space and time; yet the resurrection bodies will move much faster, and more easily, from one place to another, than our present bodies; they will be at liberty to follow the tendencies and impulses of the soul. They are glorified, bright, and shining, and can be perceived with glorified eyes alone. But this is true only in reference to the bodies of the blessed. The bodies of the damned are to be ugly and deformed, incorruptible, but capable of suffering, which is not the case with the bodies of the saints. *Thom. Aquinas*, Summ. P. iii. in Supplem. Qu. 75, ss. *Cramer*, vii. p. 777, ss. Comp. also Elucidar. c. 69. On the opinions of *Duns Scotus*, see *Ritter*, Gesch. der Philos. viii. 459, sq.

[6] *John Damascenus*, iv. 27, p. 303: Ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις· Πῶς ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί; Ὦ τῆς ἀπιστίας· ὦ τῆς ἀφροσύνης· ὁ χοῦν εἰς σωμα βουλήσει μόνῃ μεταβαλὼν, ὁ μικρὰν ῥανίδα τοῦ σπέρματος ἐν τῇ μήτρᾳ αὔξειν προστάξας, καὶ τὸ πολυειδὲς τοῦτο καὶ πολύμορφον ἀποτελεῖν τοῦ σώματος ὄργανον, οὐχὶ μᾶλλον τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ διαῤῥυὲν ἀναστήσει πάλιν, μόνον βουληθείς; Ποίῳ δὲ σώματι ἔρχονται; Ἄφρον, εἰ τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγοις πιστεύειν ἡ πώρωσις οὐ συγχωρεῖ, κἂν τοῖς ἔργοις πίστευε· σὺ γὰρ ὃ σπείρεις, οὐ ζωοποιεῖται, ἐὰν μὴ ἀποθάνῃ κ. τ. λ. (1 Cor. xv.) Θέασαι τοίνυν, ὡς ἐν τάφοις ταῖς αὔλαξι τὰ σπέρματα καταχωννύμενα. Τις ὁ τούτοις ῥίζας ἐντιθεὶς καλάμην καὶ φύλλα, καὶ ἀστάχυς καὶ τοὺς λεπτοτάτους ἀνθέρικας; οὐχ ὁ των ὅλων δημιουργός; οὐ τοῦ τὰ πάντα τεκτηναμένου τὸ πρόσταγμα; Οὕτω τοίνυν πίστευε, καὶ τῶν νεκρῶν τῇ ἀνάστασιν ἔσεσθαι θείᾳ βουλήσει, καὶ νεύματι· σύνδρομον γὰρ ἔχει τῇ βουλήσει τὴν δύναμιν.

§ 205.

THE GENERAL JUDGMENT.

The second advent of the Lord to judge the world, was interpreted as literally as possible. After it has been preceded by those signs of which Scripture speaks, Christ will appear in the same human form which he had when on earth, but in his glorified body, and as conqueror, accompanied by the heavenly hosts. The wicked, too, will behold his countenance, but with horror.[1]—The judgment it was supposed would take place in the valley of Jehosaphat, to which some, however, also applied allegorical interpretation.[2] But in proportion as theologians were disposed to give free scope to their imagination, and to represent the proceedings of the general judgment in relation to time and in a sensuous manner, the greater was the diffi-

culty to unite those various images in a single scene.[3] *Thomas Aquinas* therefore reminded them that the judgment would take place *mentaliter*, because the oral trial and defence of each individual would require too much time.[4] According to Matthew xix. 28, and 1 Cor. vi. 2, the saints are to sit with Christ in judgment; and inasmuch as monks were supposed to attain the highest degree of perfection even in this world, the power which was committed into their hands by the institution of the inquisition, would easily familiarize men with the idea of being also judged by them in the world to come.[5] It was natural that the heretics should beg to be excused from such a judgment; in accordance, too, with their entire idealistic tendency, they preferred resolving the idea of the *last* judgment into the more general notion of a retribution immediately after death.[6]

[1] *Thomas Aquinas*, *loc. cit.* Qu. 73, Art. 1: Christus...in forma gloriosa apparebit propter auctoritatem, quæ judici debetur. Ad dignitatem autem judiciariæ potestatis pertinet habere aliqua indicia, quæ ad reverentiam et subjectionem inducant, et ideo adventum Christi ad judicium venientis multa signa præcedent, ut corda hominum in subjectionem venturi judicis adducantur et ad judicium præparentur, hujusmodi signis præmoniti. Comp. Elucid. c. 70. *Disc.* Qualiter veniet Dominus ad judicium? *Mag.* Sicut Imperator ingressurus civitatem, corona ejus et alia insignia præferuntur, per quæ adventus ejus cognoscitur: ita Christus in ea forma, qua ascendit, cum Ordinibus omnibus Angelorum ad judicium veniens. Angeli crucem ejus ferentes præibunt: mortuos tuba et voce in occursum ejus excitabunt. Omnia elementa turbabuntur, tempestate ignis et frigoris mixtim undique furente. (Ps. xcvi. Wisd. v.)—Respecting the damned it is said, c. 75: Videbunt (Christum), sed ad sui perniciem. Comp. *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 90, Art. 3.

[2] Elucid. loc. cit. *D*: Erit judicium in valle Josaphat? *M.* Vallis Josaphat dicitur vallis judicii. Vallis est semper juxta montem. Vallis est hic mundus, mons est cœlum. In valle ergo fit judicium, i. e. in isto mundo, scilicet in isto aëre, ubi justi ad dexteram Christi ut oves statuentur, impii autem ut hœdi ad sinistram ponentur. Comp. *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 88, Art. 4.

[3] Thus *Thomas Aquinas* was at a loss to account for what is said concerning the sun and the moon being darkened (Matt. xxiv. 29), inasmuch as the coming of Christ will be accompanied by the fullest effusion of light, loc. cit. Qu. 73, Art. 2: Dicendum, quod, si loquamur de sole et luna, quantum ad ipsum momentum adventus Christi, sic non est credibile quod obscurabuntur sui luminis privatione, quia totus mundus innovabitur Christo veniente..... Si autem loquamur de eis secundum tempus propinquum ante judicium, sic esse poterit, quod sol et luna et alia cœli luminaria, sui luminis privatione obscurabuntur, vel diversis temporibus, vel simul, divina virtute faciente ad hominum terrorem.

[4] Ibid: Qu. 88, Art. 2, conclusio.

[5] In the work entitled Elucidarium, four classes are distinguished (instead of two as was usual—viz. the blessed and the damned), c. 71 : Unus ordo est *perfectorum, cum Deo judicantium ;* alter justorum, qui per judicium salvantur; tertius impiorum sine judicio pereuntium; quartos malorum, qui per judicium damnantur.... *Disc.* Qui sunt qui judicant? *Mag.* Apostoli, Martyres, Confessores, *Monachi*, Virgines. *D.* Quomodo judicabunt justos? *M.* Monstrabunt eos suam doctrinam et sua exempla fuisse imitatos, et ideo regno dignos. *Peter Lombard*, Lib. iv. Dist. xlvii. B. : Non autem solus Christus judicabit, sed et sancti cum eo judicabunt nationes.... Judicabunt vero non modo coöperatione, sed etiam auctoritate et potestate. Compare *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 89, where he examines the question, whether the righteous will take part in the judgment of the world merely as having places of honor (assessorie), or in reality. As the former would be too little, we may assume that they will judge in reality, provided they do so in accordance with the divine will, but not própria auctoritate. On the question, whether the angels will also take part in the judgment, see *Peter Lombard*, l. c. Litt. C. *Thomas Aquinas*, Art. 8.

[6] See *Mosheim*, p. 157 : Dicunt se credere, quod judicium extremum non sit futurum, sed quod tunc est judicium hominis solum, cum moritur.

§ 206.

PURGATORY.

From the time of Gregory the Great, the doctrine of a purifying fire, through which the souls have to pass after death, was more generally adopted. The belief in it was strengthened by facts furnished by legends.[1] Missionaries carried this notion, already developed and complete, to the nations which were newly converted ;[2] and the writers of the present age, the scholastics as well as poets and orators, gave the fullest description of it. Many believed in the real existence of purgatory as a material fire,[3] which, however, in the absence of a body susceptible of physical sufferings, torments the lost souls in an ideal manner (by means of the conception of suffering).[4] Even some who leaned to mysticism, such as *Bonaventura* and *Gerson*,[5] maintained the reality of that fire. But the practical consequences of the doctrine in question were highly pernicious, since it gave rise to the notion, that souls might be relieved from their pains, or even released from their state of suffering, sooner than would otherwise have been the case, by means of the intercessory prayers and good works of the living, and especially by means of the masses for the dead (missæ pro requie defunctorum).[6] Inasmuch as these masses and ecclesiastical indulgences were paid for, the question was started, whether the rich were not, in this respect, more privileged than the poor; to which Peter Lombard

replied in the affirmative.[7] Therefore, it is not surprising that the increasing avarice and injustice of the clergy[8] should have induced the Cathari and Waldenses,[9] as well as *Wycliffe*,[10] to combat the doctrine in question as a most dangerous one. It never met with the full approbation of the Greek Church.'[11] On the other hand, *John Wessel* endeavored to divest it of its pernicious consequences, by regarding the fire as a spiritual fire of love, which purifies the soul from its remaining dross, and consists in the longing after union with God. Accordingly, it is not so much a punishment, as the commencement of that blessedness, which God alone has the power of bringing to perfection.[12]

[1] *Bede*, Hist. Eccles. Gent. Anglor. L. iii. c. 19, v. c. 13. *Schröckh*, xx. p. 185.

[2] *Bonifacius*, Ep. xxi. c. 29. ad Serrar, quoted by *Schröckh*, loc. cit. On the doctrine of purgatory as propounded by St. Patrick, the apostle of Ireland (according to the account of Matthew Paris), see *Schröckh*, xvi. p. 229.

[3] The author of the work entitled Elucidarium, expresses himself still more indefinitely: c. 61: Post mortem vero purgatio erit *aut* nimius calor ignis, *aut* magnus rigor frigoris, *aut* aliud quodlibet genus pœnarum, de quibus tamen minimum majus est, quam maximum quod in hac vita excogitari potest.—*Hugo of St. Victor*, De Sacram. L. ii. P. xvi. c. 4: Est autem alia pœna post mortem, quae purgatoria dicitur. In qua qui ab hac vita cum quibusdam culpis, justi tamen et ad vitam prædestinati exierunt, ad tempus cruciantur, ut purgentur. The language of *Thomas Aquinas*, is more decided, Qu. 70, Art. 3, Concl.: Respondeo: Dicendum, quod ignis inferni* non sit metaphorice dictus, nec ignis imaginarius, sed verus ignis corporeus, etc. He thought, however, that all men do not go to purgatory, but only those who require it. The truly pious go at once to heaven, the decidedly wicked go at once to hell; see Qu. 69, Art. 2.

[4] Compare *Thomas Aquinas*, l. c.: Alii dixerunt, quod quamvis ignis corporeus non possit animam exurere, tamen anima apprehendit ipsum ut nocivum sibi, et ad talem apprehensionem afficitur timore et dolore. But this notion did not satisfy him fully. Comp. *Cramer*, vii. p. 773–75.

[5] *Bonav.* Comp. Theol. Verit. vii. 2. (quoted by Klee, ii. p. 333.) comp. *Schröckh*, xxix. p. 219.—Concerning the views of *Gerson* (according to Sermo ii. De Defunctis, T. iii. p. 1558), see *Schröckh*, xxxiv. p. 293.

[6] Elucidar. c. 61: Dum ibi sunt positi, apparent eis Angeli vel alii Sancti, in quorum honore aliquid egerunt in hac vita, et aut auram aut suavem odorem aut aliquod solamen eis impendunt, usque dum liberati introibunt in illam aulam, quæ non recipit ullam maculam. *Peter Lombard*, Lib. iv. Dist. xlv. B. *Thomas Aquinas*, 71, Art. 1. In his opinion, intercessory prayers (opera suffragii) do not avail per viam meriti, but per viam orationis.—He expressed himself very cautiously Art. 2, Concl.: Respondeo: Dicendum, quod charitas, quæ est vinculum ecclesiæ membra uniens, non

* By which we are to understand the fire of purgatory, as the context shows.

solum ad vivos se extendit, sed etiam ad mortuos, qui in charitate decedunt. . . . . Similiter etiam mortui in memoriis hominum viventium vivunt, et ideo intentio viventium ad eos dirigi potest, et sic suffragia vivorum mortuis dupliciter prosunt, sicut et vivis, et propter charitatis unionem, et propter intentionem in eos directam : non tamen sic eis valere credenda sunt vivorum suffragia, ut status eorum mutetur de miseria ad felicitatem vel e converso : sed valent ad *diminutionem pœnæ* vel aliquid hujusmodi, *quod statum mortui non transmutat.* Comp. Art. 6 : Respondeo : Dicendum, quod pœna purgatorii est in supplementum satisfactionis, quæ non fuerat plene in corpore consummata, et ideo, quia opera unius possunt valere alteri ad satisfactionem, sive vivus sive mortuus fuerit, non est dubium, quin suffragia per vivos facta, existentibus in purgatorio prosint. Compare Art. 10 concerning Indulgences. They are useful to the souls in purgatory indirecte, but not directe. Respecting the festival founded on this doctrine, which was first instituted in Cluny, A. D. 993, and was afterwards adopted by the whole Western Church (All Souls, Nov. 2d.) see *Sigebert Gemblacens.* ad annum 998. *Gieseler*, ii. § 33, note 15.

[7] Lib. iv. Dist. xlv. D. : Solet moveri quæstio de duobus, uno divite, altero paupere, pariter sed mediocriter bonis, qui prædictis suffragiis indigent, et meruerunt pariter post mortem juvari : pro altero vero, i. e. pro divite, speciales et communes fiunt orationes, multæque eleemosynarum largitiones ; pro paupere vero non fiunt nisi communes largitiones et orationes. Quæritur ergo, an tantum juvetur pauper paucioribus subsidiis, quantum dives amplioribus? Si non pariter juvatur, non ei redditur secundum merita. Meruit enim pariter juvari, quia pariter boni extiterunt. Si vero tantum suffragii consequitur pauper, quantum dives ; quid contulerunt diviti illa specialiter pro eo facta? Sane dici potest, non ei magis valuisse generalia et specialia, quam pauperi sola generalia suffragia. Et tamen profuerunt diviti specialia, non quidem ad aliud vel majus aliquid, sed ad idem, ad quod generalia, ut ex pluribus et diversis causis unum perciperetur emolumentum. *Potest tamen dici aliter, illa plura subsidia contulisse diviti celeriorem absolutionem, non pleniorem.* [Comp. *Neander*, Hist. Dogm. 594.]

[8] See the works on ecclesiastical history. *This* superstition was also combated by the friar *Berthold*. See *Kling*, p. 396.

[9] *Moneta*, l. iv. c. 9, § 2 : Dicit ecclesia purgatorium esse post hanc vitam animabus, quæ de hoc mundo migraverunt *inchoata condigna pœnitentia, sed nondum perfecta.* Omnes autem hæretici, tam Cathari, quam Pauperes Lugdunenses, a quodam qui dicebatur Valdisius derivati, hoc negant. The Beguines also denied, quod non est infernus, nec purgatorium ; see *Mosheim*, p. 257. On the rejection of purgatory by the Waldenses, see Dieckhoff's Waldenser, 205. *Stephen de Borbone* says that they said : Non esse pœnam purgatorii nisi in præsenti.

[10] *Schröckh* Kirchengesch. xxxiv. p. 444. The Husites (Bohemian Brethren) also questioned the reality of purgatory ; ibid. pp. 753, 754.

[11] Nevertheless the Greek Church was compelled, by the Council of Florence (A. D. 1439), to make some concessions. See *Mansi*, T. xxxi. Col. 1029. *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, pp. 313, 314. [The Synod declared : Εἰ οἱ ἀληθῶς μετανοήσαντες ἀποθάνουσιν ἐν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγάτῃ, πρὶν

τοῖς ἀξίοις τῆς μετανοίας καρποῖς ἱκανοποιῆσαι περὶ τῶν ἡμαρτημένων ὁμοῦ καὶ ἠμελημενων (in the Latin copy—de commissis et omissis), τὰς τούτων ψυχὰς καθαρτικαῖς τιμωρίαις καθαίρεσθαι (pœnis purgatoriis purgari) μετὰ θάνατον, etc. The suffrages of the faithful, masses, etc., may avail for their benefit.] Therefore *Leo Allatius* asserted, that the Eastern and Western Churches agreed in this point, in his De Ecclesiæ Occidentalis et Orientalis perpetua in Dogmate de Purgatorio Concessione. Rom. 1655. 4°.

[12] De Purgatorio, quis et qualis sit ignis purgatorius in the edition of Gröningen, p. 826, ss., quoted by *Ullmann*, Joh. Wessel, p. 363, ss.

On the locality of Purgatory, see § 208.

§ 207.

THE SLEEP OF THE SOUL.

The doctrine of purgatory had its origin in the necessity which men felt of supposing the existence of a place, where the soul, separated from the body, might dwell, until its reunion with it. The assumption of the possibility of the soul's deliverance from this intermediate state, prior to the general resurrection, gave rise to new difficulties, inasmuch as it became necessary to fill up the interval between those two moments of time. This led to a revival of the earlier notion of a death of the soul (which had been propounded by the false teachers of Arabia whom Origen combated), though under the milder form of a sleep of the soul (Psychopannychy.)[1] It is, however, uncertain, whether Pope John XXII., as is asserted, really adopted this opinion.[2] At all events, his views were opposed by the professors of the university of Paris,[3] and disapproved of by Pope Benedict XII.[4]

[1] On the Thnetopsychites, see Vol. i. § 76, note 8. Respecting the notion of a sleep of the soul (which was rejected by Tertullian), see ibid. p. 217.

[2] The idea of a sleep of the soul was by no means distinctly expressed in those words of his which were thought objectionable (they occur in a sermon preached on the first Sunday in Advent 1331); on the contrary, all that is there said is, quod animæ decedentium in gratia non videant Deum per essentiam, nec sint perfecte beatæ, nisi post resumptionem corporis.—This opinion perfectly agreed with the views of earlier theologians. Comp. Vol. i. § 77. But from the fifth century on, it was abandoned and condemned, A. D. 1240, by the University of Paris. *D'Argentré*, Collectio Judiciorum de novis Erroribus, i. 186. *Gieseler*, iii. p. 54, ss.

[3] See *d'Argentrée* Collectio Judic. T. i. p. 316, ss. *Bulœus* T. iv. p. 235. *Gieseler*, loc. cit. *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 312.

[4] A. D. 1366, Jan. 29th. See Raynald, ad hunc annum, No. 3.—*Gieseler*

and *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, l. c. On the pretended recantation of Pope John XXII. see *Gieseler*, l. c. On a picture, representing the state of the departed, see *Quandt*, Reise ins mittägliche Frankreich, 149.

§ 208.

THE LOCALITIES OF THE FUTURE WORLD.

(*Heaven, Hell, and Intermediate State.*)

The scholastics endeavoured to draw into the sphere of their researches, not only the bright regions of heaven, but also the dark abodes of hell. Thus, heaven was divided into three parts—viz. the *visible* heavens (the firmament), the *spiritual* heaven, where saints and angels dwell, and the *intellectual* heaven, where the blessed enjoy the immediate vision of the Triune God.[1] Different departments (receptacula) were also ascribed to hell.[2] These were, 1. Hell, properly so called, where the devils and the damned are confined ;[3] 2. Those subterranean regions which may be regarded as the intermediate states between heaven and hell, and which are again subdivided into (*a*), Purgatory, which lies nearest to hell ;[4] (*b*), The Limbus Infantum (puerorum), where those children remain who die unbaptized ;[5] (*c*), The Limbus Patrum, the abode of the Old Testament saints, the place to which Christ went to preach redemption to the souls in prison. The Limbus last mentioned was also called Abraham's bosom ; different opinions obtained concerning its relation of proximity to heaven and hell.[6] These positions were rejected by the mystics, who were inclined to more spiritual views, and assigned to subjective states what the scholastics fixed in external localities.[7]

[1] Elucidarium c. 3.—Paradiso was also supposed to be there. Comp. c. 50, and note 7.

[2] *Peter Lombard*, Lib. iv. Dist. xlv. A. *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 69, Art. 1, ss. *Cramer*, vii. p. 771–73.

[3] Elucidar. c. 62, *D.*: Quid est infernus? vel ubi? *M.* Duo sunt inferni, superior et inferior. Superior infima pars hujus mundi, quæ plena est pœnis, nam hic exundat nimius æstus, magnum frigus, etc. Inferior vero est locus spiritualis, ubi ignis inextinguibilis.....qui sub terra dicitur esse, ut, sicut corpora peccantium terra cooperiuntur, ita animæ peccantium sub terra in inferno sepeliantur.*

* The term "Hölle," (hell) had primarily the more comprehensive signification of the netherworld (whence the phrase in the Apostles' Creed, "he descended into hell"). It was not till later (from the thirteenth century) that the word was used to denote the place of torment. Comp. *Grimm's* deutsche Mythologie, p. 462.—"*The Christians substituted, in place of the heathenish notion of a pale and gloomy hell, that of a pool filled with flames and*

[4] See above § 206.

[5] According to *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 69, Art. 6, the limbus puerorum is distinguished from the limbus patrum, secundum qualitatem præmii vel pœnæ, because children who die without baptism have not that hope of eternal salvation which the fathers had prior to the manifestation of Christ. As regards the site (situs), it is probable that the limbus puerorum lies nearer to hell than the limbus patrum. Others, however, identified the one with the other. Thus friar *Berthold* says (quoted by Kling, p. 443): "If your children die without baptism, or are baptised improperly, they can never enter into the heavenly joys. They go, together with the Jewish and Gentile children, who are still without belief, to the limbus to which those of old went. There they do not suffer any pain, except this, that they do not go to heaven." Comp. p. 210. Those children who are baptised, ride in the little carriage (the constellation of the Little Bear) straight to heaven (paradise). But if the child happened to be baptised improperly, one of the wheels breaks, and the child is lost. See ibid. pp. 169, 170.

[6] Thomas Aquinas treated of this point very fully, l. c. Art. 4. He made a distinction between the state *prior* to the coming of Christ, and that *posterior* to that event. Quia ante Christi adventum Sanctorum requies habebat defectum requiei adjunctum, dicebatur idem infernus et sinus Abrahæ, unde ibi non videbatur Deus. Sed quia post Christi adventum Sanctorum requies est completa, cum Deum videant, talis requies dicitur sinus Abrahæ, et nullo modo infernus. Et ad hunc sinum Abrahæ ecclesia orat fideles perduci. Comp. Elucidar. 64, D.: In quo inferno erant justi ante adventum Christi? M. In superiori, in quodam loco juncto inferiori, in quo poterant alterutrum conspicere. Qui erant ibi, quamvis carerent supplicio, videbatur eis esse in inferno, cum essent separati a regno. Illis autem, qui erant in inferiori inferno, videbatur, quod illi, qui erant in illo inferno juncto inferiori, erant in refrigerio paradisi, unde et dives rogabat a Lazaro, guttam super se stillari. D. Quam pœnam habebant illi, qui erant in illo inferno juncto inferiori? M. Quasdam tenebras tantum, unde dicitur: "*Habitantibus in regione umbræ mortis, lux orta est eis.*" Quidam ex eis erant in quibusdam pœnis. Venit ergo Dominus ad infernum superiorem nascendo, ut redimeret captivos a tyranno, ut dicitur: "*Dices his, qui vincti sunt: Exite, et his qui in tenebris sunt: Relevamini.*" Vinctos vocat, qui erant in pœnis, alios vero in tenebris, quos omnes absolvit et in gloriam duxit res gloriæ. Comp. Dante, Divina Commedia, *Hell*, 4, comp. 31, ss.

[7] The author of the work entitled Elucidarium expressed himself as follows, c. 59: Paradisus non est locus corporalis, quia spiritus non habitant in locis; sed est spiritualis mansio beatorum, quam æterna sapientia perfecit in initio, et est intellectuali cœlo [comp. note 1], ubi ipsa divinitas, qualis est, ab eis facie ad faciem contuetur. The language of *Tauler* (Predigten, i. pp. 291, 292,) was still more spiritualising:.....Christ granted to the thief on the cross "to behold himself, his divine countenance and nature, which is

brimstone, pitchdark, and yet at the same time bright like fire, in which the souls of the damned are always burning." *Grimm.* l. c. p. 464. On the mixture of Christian with Gentile notions, ibid. p. 465.

the true and living paradise of all pleasures. To behold the glory of God is what constitutes paradise."*

§ 209.

THE STATE OF THE BLESSED AND THE DAMNED.

Both the spirit of the age, and its degree of culture, were reflected in the representations and descriptions of heaven and hell. According to *John Scotus Erigena*, the personal spirit of man is resolved into God, a notion which he thought reconcilable with the idea of self-conscious continuance.[1] The pantheistic sects of the middle ages went so far as to destroy all individuality, and to deny the future life.[2] The scholastics, whose principal happiness even in this world consisted in making the most subtile distinctions, supposed that the greater acuteness of the intellectual powers would constitute the especial blessedness of heaven ; *Duns Scotus* started such questions as, whether the blessed would perceive the quiddítates of things, etc.[3] The paradisaical enjoyments of refined senses were not quite excluded, though it was admitted, that the highest and real pleasures would consist principally in communion with God, and the mutual fellowship of the saints.[4] *Thomas Aquinas* supposed different gifts (dotes) of blessedness. In addition to the *corona aurea*, which is given to all the blessed, there are particular *aureolæ* for martyrs and saints, for monks and nuns.[5] The mystics also represented the world to come in bright colors.[6] But the age was especially inventive in devising all sorts of ingenious punishments which the wicked would have to suffer in hell, after the refined cruelty of the criminal processes of the inquisition.[7] According to *Thomas Aquinas*, the torments of the damned consist in useless repentance.[8] They can neither change for the better nor for the worse.[9] They hate God and curse the state of the blessed.[10] But the latter are not disturbed in the enjoyment of their happiness by any feeling of compassion.[11] The views of *John Scotus Erigena* differed from the popular notion in making the consciousness of sin itself, and of its impotence, to constitute the principal misery of the damned.[12] *Master Eckart* declared it to be a spiritual nonentity,[13] an expression from which the Beghards drew the hasty inference that hell had no existence.[14]

[1] De Div. Nat. v. 8, p. 232 : Prima igitur humanæ naturæ reversio est, quando corpus solvitur, et in quatuor elementa sensibilis mundi, ex quibus compositum est, revocatur. Secunda in resurrectione implebitur, quando unus-

* On the relation between the Christian notions of paradise commonly entertained, and the earlier ideas of heathen nations (the Walhalla), see *Grimm*, deutsche Mythologie, p. 475.

quisque suum proprium corpus ex communione quatuor elementorum recipiet. Tertia, quando corpus in spiritum mutabitur. Quarta, quando spiritus et, ut apertius dicam, tota hominis natura in primordiales causas revertetur, quæ sunt semper et incommutabiliter in Deo. Quinta, quando ipsa natura cum suis causis movebitur in Deum, sicut aër movetur in lucem. Erit enim Deus omnia in omnibus: quando nihil erit nisi solus Deus.....Mutatio itaque humanæ naturæ in Deum, non in substantiæ interitu æstimanda est, sed in pristinum statum, quem prævaricando perdiderat, mirabilis atque ineffabilis reversio. Pag. 234:.....Inferiora vero a superioribus naturaliter attrahuntur et absorbentur, non ut non sint, sed ut in eis plus salventur et subsistant et unum sint. Nam neque aër suam perdit substantiam, cum totus in solare lumen convertitur: in tantum, ut nihil in eo appareat nisi lux, cum aliud sit lux, aliud aër: lux tamen prævalet in aëre, ut sola videatur esse. Ferrum aut aliud aliquod metallum in igne liquefactum, in ignem converti videtur, ut ignis purus videatur esse, salva metalli substantia permanente. Eadem ratione existimo corporalem substantiam in animam esse transiturum: non ut pereat quod sit, sed ut in meliori essentia salva sit. Similiter de ipsa anima intelligendum, quod ita in intellectum movebitur, ut in eo pulchrior Deoque similior conservetur. Nec aliter dixerim de transitu, ut non adhuc dicam omnium, sed rationabilium substantiarum in Deum, in quo cuncta finem positura sunt, et unum erunt.—As the many separate lights (*e. g.* in a church) form together *one sea of light*, though every single light may be removed, as a part may be taken from the whole; and as many voices form together *one* chorus, without losing their individuality in one confused mass of sounds, so are souls related to God. Comp. cap. 12 and 13, p. 236.

[2] Thus *Amalrich of Bena* taught: He who possesses the knowledge of God, has paradise *within* himself; but he who commits a mortal sin, has hell in his own heart, as a man has a bad tooth in his mouth. Compare *Engelhardt*, p. 255. Concerning his followers it is said: Item semetipsos jam resuscitatos asserebant, fidem et spem ab eorum cordibus excludebant, se soli scientiæ mentientes subjacere; ibid. p. 259. Comp. p. 260: Dixit etiam (Amalricus), quod Deus ideo dicitur finis omnium, quia omnia reversura sunt in ipsum, ut in Deo immutabiliter quiescant, et unum individuum atque incommutabile in eo permanebunt; et sicut alterius naturæ non est Abraham, alterius Isaak, sed unius atque ejusdem, sic dixit omnia esse unum et omnia esse Deum. The Beguines made the same assertions. Comp. § 204, note 2.

[3] *John Scotus Erigena*, v. c. 31, ss.:—*Peter Lombard*, Lib. iv. Dist. 49, A: Habere ergo vitam, est *videre* vitam, *cognoscere* Deum in specie (according to John xvii.).—Elucid. 79: His (beatis) Salomonis sapientia esset magna insipientia. Porro ipsi omni sapientia affluunt, omnem scientiam de ipso fonte sapientiæ Dei hauriunt. Omnia quippe præterita, præsentia, et si qua futura sunt, perfecte sciunt. Omnium omnino hominum, sive in cœlo, sive in inferno, nomina, genera, opera bona vel mala unquam ab eis gesta norunt, et nihil est quod eos lateat, cum in sole justitiæ pariter videant omnia.—*Thom. Aquin.*, Qu. 92, Art. 1, 2, 3.—*Duns Scotus*, quoted by *Cramer*, vii. pp. 786, 787.

[a] Elucid. 77: Salomonis deliciæ essent eis miseriæ. O qualis est justorum voluptas, quibus ipse Deus fons omnium bonorum est insatiabilis satians satietas. Duæ sunt beatitudines, una minor Paradisi, altera major cœlestis regni. (We have no idea of it, and can infer the notion of happiness only in a negative way from that of unhappiness.).....Sicut ferrum alicujus capiti si esset infixum et sic candens per omnia membra transiret, sicut ille dolorem haberet, ita ipsi per contrarium modum in omnibus membris suis interius et exterius voluptatem habent.....O qualem voluptatem visus ipsi habebunt, qui ita clausis sicut apertis oculis videbunt.....O qualis voluptas auditus illorum, quibus incessanter sonent harmoniæ cœlorum et concentus Angelorum, dulcisona organa omnium Sanctorum. Olfactio qualis, ubi suavissimum odoremde ipso suavitatis fonte haurient, et odorem de Angelis et omnibus Sanctis percipient. Eia qualis voluptas gustus, ubi epulantur et exultant in conspectu Dei, et, cum apparuerit gloria Dei, saturabuntur et ab ubertate domus ejus inebriabuntur (Ps. lxxvi. Ps. xvi. Ps. xxxv). Voluptas tactus qualis, ubi omnia aspera et dura aberunt, et omnia blanda et suavia arridebunt.—Nor will the recollection of sins formerly committed, but now expiated, disturb the enjoyment of heavenly bliss. Cap. 79. Concerning the blessedness arising from the fellowship of the saints, see ibidem: Nihil plus cupient, quam habebunt, et nihil plus potest adjici gaudio eorum. Quod enim quisque in se non habuerit, in altero habebit, ut. v. g. Petrus in Joanne, gloriam habebit virginitatis, Joannes in Petro gloriam passionis. Et ita gloria uniuscujusque erit omnium, et gloria omnium uniuscujusque erit. .....O Deus, quale gaudium habebunt, qui Patrem in Filio, et Verbum in Patre, et Spiritus Sancti charitatem in utroque, sicuti est, facie ad faciem semper videbunt. Gaudium habebunt de consortio Angelorum, gaudium de contubernio omnium Sanctorum.

[b] According to *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 95, Art. 2, the following distinction may be made between *beatitudo* and *dos:* Dos datur sine meritis, sed beatitudo non datur, sed redditur pro meritis. Præterea: beatitudo est una tantum, dotes vero sunt plures. Præterea: beatitudo inest homini secundum id quod est potissimum in eo, sed dos etiam in corpore ponitur.—According to Art. 5, there are three dotes: visio, quæ fidei, comprehensio, quæ spei, fruitio, quæ charitati respondet. On the relation in which the particular aureolæ stand to the corona (aurea), see Qu. 96. Art. 1: Præmium essentiale hominis, quod est ejus beatitudo, consistit in perfecta conjunctione animæ ad Deum, in quantum eo perfecte fruitur, ut viso et amato perfecte: hoc autem præmium metaphorice corona dicitur vel aurea; tum ex parte meriti, quod cum quadam pugna agitur, tum etiam ex parte præmii, per quod homo efficitur quodammodo divinitatis particeps, et per consequens regiæ potestatis. .....Significat etiam corona perfectionem quandam ratione figuræ circularis, ut ex hoc etiam competat perfectioni beatorum. Sed quia nihil potest superaddi essentiali, quin sit eo minus: ideo superadditum præmium aureola nominatur. Huic autem essentiali præmio, quod aurea dicitur, aliquid superadditur dupliciter: uno modo ex conditione naturæ ejus, qui præmiatur, sicut supra beatitudinem animæ gloria corporis adjungitur, unde et ipsa gloria corporis interdum aureola nominatur.....; alio modo ex ratione operis meritorii, etc. In Art. 2. aureola is further distinguished from fruc-

tus: Fructus consistit in gaudio habito de dispositione ipsius operantis, aureola in gaudio perfectionis operum (the one is the subjective reward, the other is the objective one). Compare the subsequent notes.

* *Suso*, Von der unmässigen Freude des Himmelreichs (quoted by *Diepenbrock*, p. 293, ss. *Wackernagels* Lesebuch, i. Sp. 881, ss.): "Now arise with me, I will lead thee to contemplation, and cause thee to cast a look at a parable. Behold! above the ninth heaven, which is far more than a hundred thousand times larger than our whole globe, there is yet another heaven, which is called cœlum empyreum, and has its name, not from its being a fiery substance, but from the intense shining brightness which it possesses by nature. It is immovable and unchangeable, and is the glorious court where the heavenly hosts dwell, and where the evening star, and all the children of God, sing unceasing praise and adoration. There are the eternal thrones, surrounded by the incomprehensible light, from which the evil spirits were cast out, and which are now occupied by the elect. Behold the wonderful city shining with pure gold, glittering with precious pearls, inlaid with precious jewels, transparent like a crystal, resplendent with red roses, white lilies, and all sorts of living flowers. Now cast thine own eyes upon the beautiful heavenly fields. Aye! behold the full delight of summer, the meadows of the bright May, the true valley of delight; behold happy moments spent in mutual love, harps, viols, singing, springing, dancing, and pleasures without end; behold the fulfilment of every desire, and love without sorrow, in everlasting security. And behold, round about thee, the innumerable multitude of the redeemed, drinking of the fountain of living water after their hearts' desire, and looking in the pure and clear mirror of the unveiled Deity, in which all things are made manifest to them. Proceed further, and behold the sweet queen of the heavenly country, whom thou lovest with such intensity, occupying her throne with dignity and joy, elevated above all the heavenly hosts, surrounded by rose-flowers and lilies of the valley. Behold her wonderful beauty imparting joy, and delight, and glory, to all the heavenly hosts, etc.....behold the bright cherubim and their company, receiving a bright emanation of the eternal, incomprehensible light, and the heavenly principalities and powers enjoying sweet repose in me, and I in them.....behold my elect disciples, and my very best friends, occupying the venerable thrones of judgment in great peace and honor; behold the martyrs shining in their robes red like roses, the confessors shining in their splendid beauty, the tender virgins shining in angelic purity, and all the heavenly host enjoying divine sweetness! Aye, what a company, and what a happy country!" But Suso regards all this as a mere image. In his opinion, true happiness, "the essential recompense," as distinct from that which is "accidental," consists in union with God.—P. 296: "Essential reward consists in the union of the soul with the pure Deity in the beatific vision. For never more can the soul be in repose until it is elevated above all its powers and possibilities, and brought into the very essence of the person, into the natural simplicity of its essence. And in this union and reaction it finds its satisfaction and eternal blessedness; the more entire and simple the outgoing, the freer is the upgoing, the surer is the entrance into the wild waste and the deep abyss of essential deity, with which it is ab-

sorbed, whelmed and united; so that it wills nothing but what God wills and becomes the same that God is; it becomes blessed through grace, as He is blessed by nature." Much, however, as Suso exalts this "swallowing up" of the human spirit in the divine, he yet insists upon the perpetuity of the individual consciousness. "In this absorption of the soul in the deity, it vanishes, *but not wholly;* it gains some property of divinity, but it does not become essential God; all that happens to it comes through grace, for the soul is an existence, created from nothing, eternally loved and favored." *Schmidt*, ubi supra, 50 (*Diepenbrock*, 227). Compare the dialogues, there cited, of Suso "with the wild ones," which show that Eckart's disciples were divided into two classes, the one of which adopted the pantheistic consequences of his system, and the other not; Suso belonged to the latter class.

[7] Elucidarium c. 80: Ecce, sicut isti amici Dei decore maximo illustrantur, ita illi maximo horrore deturpantur. Sicut isti summa agilitate sunt alleviati, ita illi summa pigrititia prægravati. Sicut isti præcipuo robore solidati, ita illi sunt præcipua invaletudine debilitati. Sicut isti augusta libertate potiuntur, ita illi anxia servitute deprimuntur. Sicut isti immensa voluptate deliciantur, ita illi immensa miseria amaricantur. Sicut isti egregia sanitate vigent, ita illi infinita infirmitate deficient. Sicut isti de beata immortalitate triumphantes lætantur, ita illi de dolenda sua diuturnitate lamentantur. Sicut isti politi sunt splendore sapientiæ, ita illi obscurati sunt horrore insipientiæ. Si quid enim sciunt, ad augmentum doloris sciunt. Sicut istos dulcis amicita copulat, ita illos amara inimicitia excruciat. Sicut isti concordem concordiam cum omni creatura habentes, ab omni creatura glorificantur, ita illi, cum omni creatura discordiam habentes, ab omni creatura execrantur. Sicut isti summa potentia sublimantur, ita illi summa impotentia angustiantur.....Sicut isti ineffabili gaudio jubilantes, ita illi mœrore sine fine ejulantes, etc....According to Thomas Aquinas, Qu. 97, Art. 4, outer darkness reigns in hell, and only so much light is admitted as is sufficient to see that which is to torment the souls. The fire is (according to Art. 5 and 6) a real, material fire, differing only in a few points (but not specifically) from terrestrial fire. It is under the surface of the earth, etc.—*Gilbert of Nogent*, however, denied that the fire was material (he died A. D. 1124). See *Gieseler*, Dogmengesch. 564. [Gilbert, in his De Pignoribus Sanctorum, lib. iv. ca 4, says, the punishments of hell consist in the pangs of an evil conscience.] A full description of the torments of hell is given by Dante. [Dante's descriptions are perhaps derived from the Elucidarium, which is printed among Anselm's works, but which is not his; it has also been ascribed to *Gilbert of Nogent*. The Elucidarium was freely used by Aquinas.]

[8] *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 98, Art. 2: Pœnitere de peccato, contingit dupliciter. Uno modo per se, alio modo per accidens. Per se quidem de peccato pœnitet, qui peccatum, in quantum est peccatum, abominatur. Per accidens vero, qui illud odit, ratione alicujus adjuncti, utpote pœnæ vel alicujus hujusmodi. Mali igitur non pœnitebunt, per se loquendo, de peccatis, quia voluntas malitiæ peccati in eis remanet: pœnitebunt autem per accidens, in quantum affligentur de pœna, quam pro peccato sustinent. (He seems to imply of an attritio, sine contritione.)

[9] Loco citato, Art. 6: Post diem judicii erit ultima consummatio bonorum et malorum, ita quod nihil erit addendum ulterius de bono vel de malo. Comp. *Peter Lombard*, Lib. iv. Dist. 50, A.

[10] Elucidarium, 80: Odium enim Dei habent.....odium habent Angelorum.....odium habent omnium Sanctorum.....odium a novo cœlo et a nova terra et ab omni creatura habent. Comp. *Thomas Aquinas*, l. c. Art. 4: Tanta erit invidia in damnatis, quod etiam propinquorum gloriæ invidebunt, cum ipsi sint in summa miseria.....Sed tamen minus invident propinquis quam aliis, et major esset eorum pœna, si omnes propinqui damnarentur et alii salvarentur, quam si aliqui de suis propinquis salvarentur. (He then quotes the instance of Lazarus.)—As regards the hatred which the lost feel towards God, comp. Art. 5. God as such cannot be hated, but ratione effectuum.

[11] *Peter Lombard*, Lib. iv. Dist. 50, G. *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 94, Art. 2, 3. They witness the sufferings of the damned, without being seen by the latter. *Peter Lombard*, l. c. Litt. E. *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 98, Art. 9.

[12] De Div. Nat. v. 29, p. 265: diversas suppliciorum formas non localiter in quadam parte, veluti toto hujus visibilis creaturæ, et ut simpliciter dicam, neque intra diversitatem totius naturæ a Deo conditæ futuras esse credimus, et neque nunc esse, et nusquam et nunquam, sed in malarum voluntatum corruptarumque conscientiarum perversis motibus, tardaque pœnitentia et infructuosa, inque perversæ potestatis omnimoda subversione, sive humana sive angelica creatura. Comp. c. 36, p. 288, c. 37, p. 294, and some other passages. *Frommüller* (Tübinger Zeitschrift, 1830, part 1, p. 84, ss.*) *Guibert of Nogent* entertained similar views, De Pignoribus Sanctorum (in Opp. ed. d'Achery. Par. 1651, fol.), Lib. c. 14, p. 363. *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 96–98.

[13] The question has been started, what that is which burns in hell. The masters generally say, it is self-will. But I say, in truth, it is *not having* [*Nicht*] which constitutes the burning of hell. Learn this from a parable. If you were to take a burning coal, and put it on my hand, and I were to assert that the coal is burning my hand, I should be wrong. But if I be asked what it is that burns me, I say, it is the not having, *i. e.*, the coal has something which my hand has not. You perceive, then, that it is the not having which burns me. But if my hand had all that which the coal has, it would possess the nature of fire. In that case you might take all the fire that burns, and put it on my hand, without tormenting me. In the same manner I say, if God, and those who stand before his face, enjoy that perfect happiness, which those who are separated from him possess not, it is the "*not having*" which torments the souls in hell more than self-will or fire. Predigt. auf den ersten Sonntag nach Trinitatis, quoted by *Schmidt* (Studien und Kritiken, 1839, p. 722.)

[14] *Schmidt*, however, thinks it probable (l. c.) that the assertion of the Bishop of Strasburg (quoted by *Mosheim*, p. 257), that the Beghards taught, quod non est infernus, nec purgatorium (§ 206, note 9), was founded upon a

* In other passages, however, Erigena speaks of material fire, and illustrates the possibility of its perpetuity by the asbestos and the salamander; De Præd. 17, 7. 19, 1. 4. *Ritter*, Gesch. der Philosophie, vii. 282.

mistake. They are further said to have maintained: quod nullus damnabitur nec Judæus, nec Sarazenus, quia mortuo corpore spiritus redibit ad Dominum.

§ 210.

ETERNITY OF THE PUNISHMENT OF HELL. RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS.

John Scotus Erigena, on the basis of the universality of redemption, ventured to intimate a revival of the notion of Origen, concerning the restitution of all things, without denying the eternity of the punishments of hell.[1] This idea met with approbation among the mystical sects.[2] The Catholic Church, however, simply retained the doctrine of the eternity of the punishments of hell;[3] as is exemplified in the concise superscription to the hell of Dante.[4] The imagination of the orthodox mystics, inflamed by the vision of infinite woe, dwelt with painful elaboration upon this forever and ever.[5]

[1] Erigena maintained, with Augustine, the eternity of the punishments of hell, De Div. Nat. v. 31, p. 270. Nevertheless he said, p. 72: Aliud est omnem malitiam generaliter in omni humana natura penitus aboleri, aliud phantasias ejus, malitiæ dico, in propria conscientia eorum, quos in hac vita vitiaverat, semper servari, eoque modo semper puniri. Comp. v. 26, p. 255, 56, v. 27, p. 260: Divina siquidem bonitas consumet malitiam, æterna vita absorbet mortem, beatitudo miseriam.....nisi forte adhuc ambigis dominum Jesum humanæ naturæ acceptorem et salvatorem non totam ipsam, sed quantulamcunque partem ejus accepisse et salvasse. *Frommüller*, l. c. pp. 86, 87.

[2] Comp. § 209, note 14, and § 202.

[3] *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 99.

[4] Canto iii. v. 9: "*Ye who enter here, leave all hope behind.*"

[5] *Suso* (Büchlein von der Weisheit, cap. xi. Von immerwährendem Weh der Hölle, quoted by *Diepenbrock*, pp. 289, 290, by Wackernagel, Sp. 879), expressed himself as follows:—Alas! misery and pain, they must last for ever. O! eternity, what art thou? O! end without end! O! death which is above every death, to die every hour and yet not to be able ever to die! O! father and mother and all whom we love! May God be merciful to you for evermore; for we shall see you no more to love you; we must be separated for ever! O! separation, everlasting separation, how painful art thou! O! the wringing of hands! O! sobbing, sighing, and weeping, unceasing howling and lamenting, and yet never to be heard!.... Give us a millstone, say the damned, as large as the whole earth, and so wide in circumference as to touch the sky all around, and let a little bird come once in a hundred thousand years, and pick off a small particle of the stone, not larger than the tenth part of a grain of millet, and after another hundred thousand years let him come again, so that in ten hundred thousand years he would pick off as much as a grain of millet, we wretched sinners would ask nothing but that when this stone has an end, our pains might also cease; yet even that cannot be!

FOURTH PERIOD.

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE RISE OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF LEIBNITZ AND WOLF IN GERMANY: FROM THE YEAR 1517 TO ABOUT 1720.

THE AGE OF POLEMICO-ECCLESIASTICAL SYMBOLISM; THE CONFLICT OF CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.

A. GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FOURTH PERIOD.

§ 211.

INTRODUCTION.

On the sources, and the works on the history of the Reformation, compare *Hase*, Church History, New York edition, p. 358, *sq.*, and *Gieseler*, Church History, New York edition, Vol. IV. p. 9, *sq.*

The Reformation of the sixteenth century was neither a mere scientific reform of doctrine, nor a revolution which affected only the external relations of life (church polity and form of worship), without touching doctrinal questions. It was rather *a comprehensive reformation of the Church on the basis of the newly awakened evangelical faith, as it manifested itself in its practical and moral aspects.* As primitive Christianity did not present a complete scheme of systematic theology to its adherents, so those who restored a pure and Scriptural religion did not make it their first object to establish a perfected and final system of doctrines. The heart, and the actions of the heart, preceded, scientific forms of statement followed in slow progression. Thus the publication of the 95 theses (A. D. 1517, Oct. 31st), in which Luther came out against Tetzel on high

moral grounds, and the zeal which Zwingle displayed about the same time, in combating the prevailing abuses of the Church, and the corruptions of his age, became the signal for further contests. The attack upon the sale of indulgences shook scholasticism to its very foundations; starting from this, the opposition to all that was unscriptural in the constitution of the Church, as well as in its doctrines, soon spread further, though its success was not everywhere the same.

"*Questions concerning ultimate philosophical principles were, on the whole, not in the spirit and thoughts of that age:*" *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Compendium der Dogmengeschichte, i. p. 326. "It was neither the vulgar jealousy of the monastic orders against each other, nor yet any mere theoretical interest, however noble this might have been, which led Luther in the path of reform. Luther became a reformer because he had learned at the confessional the spiritual wants of the people....It was from a heartfelt sympathy with simple and honest souls, whom he saw abandoned to the arbitrary will of the priesthood, and deceived in respect to the highest good of life:" Der heutige Protestantismus, seine Vergangenheit und seine heutige Lebensfragen, Frankf., 1847, p. 13. See also *Gass*, Gesch. d. Protest. Dogmatik, i. p. 7, *sq.* [*Reuter*, Eigenthümlichkeit d. sittlichen Lendenz des Protest. im Verhältnisse zum Katholicism, in Jahrb. f. d. Theol., 1860. *Brownson's* Qu. Rev., Jan., 1855. *Whately*, Errors of Romanism traced to Human Nature, 1849.]

§ 212.

THE PRINCIPLES OF PROTESTANTISM.

**Göbel, M.*, die religiöse Eigenthümlichkeit der lutherischen und der reformirten Kirche. Bonn, 1837. *Dorner*, Das Princip unserer Kirche nach dem inneren Verhältniss seiner zwei Seiten., Kiel, 1842. **Schenkel*, Das Wesen des Protestantismus aus den Quellen, 3 Bde., Schaffh. 1846–52. *Ibid.*, Das Princip des Protestantismus mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der neueren hierüber geführten Verhandlungen. Schaffh. 1852. *J. H. Merle d'Aubigne*, Luther und Calvin, oder die luth. u. reform. Kirche in ihrer Verschiedenheit und wesentlich. Einheit; deutsch von *P. E. Gottheil*, Baireuth, 1849. [English, in D'Aubigné and his Writings, New York, 1846, pp. 245–273; comp. Christ. and Protest., ibid. pp. 125–145.] *F. Baur*, Kritische Studien über d. Wesen des Protest. in Zeller's Jahrb., 1847, s. 506, *sq.* *H. Heppe*, Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantism. im 16 Jahrh. [3 Bde. Gotha, 1857–9.] See the works referred to in the following sections. [For *Hagenbach's* review of *Schenkel's* work, see Studien und Kritiken, Jan., 1853; *De Wette* on *Schenkel*, ibid., 1848. *C. Beck*, D. Princip des Protest. in Stud. u. Krit., 1851. *F. A. Holzhausen*, Der Protestantism. 3 Bde. 1846, *sq.* *Hundeshagen*, d. deutsche Protestantism. 3d ed., 1849. *Thiersch*, Protest. u. Kathol. *Dietlein*, Protest. und Kathol. Halle, 1854. *Twesten*, on Cathol. and Protest. in his Dogmatik d. Luth. Kirche, i. s. 96–217; and Princip ds. Protest., ibid. s. 273–282. *Baur*, D. Princip d. Protest. in Theol. Jahrb. (Tübingen), 1855. *De Remusat*, Protest. et Reform. in the Revue des deux Mondes, June, 1854. *Rothe*, Zur Dogmatik, in Stud. und Kritik., 1855, s. 779, *sq.*, on the two Protestant principles, as different aspects of the same truth.—*Jeremy Taylor*, Dissuasives from Popery. *J. E. Cox*, Protest. and Popery Contrasted, 2 vols., Oxf., 1851. Oxford Tracts for Times, passim.]

The common principle on which the Reformers planted themselves, was only the principle of Christianity itself, as revealed in the canonical Scriptures. The only difference was in the mode

in which they respectively attained and enforced this principle, which was determined by their personal characteristics and by external circumstances. Luther, by the deep experience of his own heart and life, was led to the *material* principle of Protestantism, viz., justification by faith, which is the central point for the right understanding of the development of the whole Protestant system of theology. With this is connected the breaking away from the authority of the Church, and the subjection to the authority of Scripture, or the *formal* principle of the Reformation. Both principles belong together.[1] Though there is a relative truth in the remark, that the Reformation, as aroused and led by Luther in Germany, laid the most stress on the *material* principle, and that the Zwinglian (later, the Calvinistic, or Reformed) movement in Switzerland preponderated in favor of the *formal* principle,[2] yet the difference of these two main tendencies, which sprung up within the bosom of Protestantism, is not fully and satisfactorily explained by their difference on this point.[3]

[1] See *A. Schweizer*, Glaubenslehre der evang. Ref. Kirche, Zürich, 1844, Bd. i. s. 3. *Baur*, Lehrbuch d. Dogmengesch. [s. 272–284, 2d ed. Baur says, that the most general difference between Catholicism and Protestantism is found in the different relation, in which what is external and what is internal in religion, are put to one another. As external as is Catholicism, so internal is Protestantism.... In opposition to the externality of Catholicism the fundamental idea of Protestantism is that of the absolute value of the religious sentiment, in distinction from all that is merely external. All that is external has a value only in relation to this internal experience and conviction. In this aspect the principle of subjectivity is the principle of Protestantism; but this is only one side of its nature. The other, equally essential, is the objective element, viz., that in all that concerns his salvation, man is entirely dependent on God and divine grace. Freedom and dependence, self-activity and absolute dependence, together make up the essence of Protestantism; as is most signally manifest in the first epoch of its history. And here, too, are the elements of the problem, which it has ever since been discussing.]

[2] *M. Goebel*, *ubi supra*. Compare *Ullmann*, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1843, s. 756, *sq.*

[3] *Schweizer*, Glaubenslehre, i. 35, 38, 40. *Schenkel*, Wesen des Protest. i. 11. *Ebrard*, Abendmahlslehre, ii. 25, *sq.* The difference of the two has also been thus stated: the one (the Lutheran) was chiefly devoted to opposing the Judaism, and the other (the Reformed) to opposing the heathenism of the old Church; so *Herzog* in Tholuck's lit. Anzeiger, 1838, No. 54, *sq.*; *Schweizer*, *ubi supra*, s. 15. But even this cannot be carried out without qualifications. *Schweizer* says, that the peculiarity of the Reformed (Calvinistic) theology consisted in holding fast to the absolute idea of God in opposition to all idolatry of the creature, while the centre of gravity of the Lutheran system is to be sought after in the sphere of anthropology. *Ebrard's* position (*ubi supra*, 27) is, that the material principle of justifica-

tion by faith is common to both, and that the difference consists in this, that Luther emphasized this justification (subjectively) in opposition to works, while Zwingle insisted upon it (objectively) in contrast with human mediation and reconciliation.—So much seems to be certain, that no fundamental difference can be said to exist between the principles of the Lutheran and Zwinglian reformation, but a difference simply in the mode of combining the external and internal conditions, under which the common principles were established and modified. Comp. below § 219, note 3. [See also *Baur*, Dogmengesch., *ubi supra*, who says, that the real Protestant antagonism to Catholicism is found in Calvinism, and there too in the very doctrine, which was at first common to all the reformers, but which attained its systematic development only in Calvinism, that is, the absolute decree. Against the Catholic absolutism of the external church was placed the Calvinistic absolutism of the divine purpose—it is immanent in God. The Melancthonian type of theology, with its principle of moral freedom, is here, on the Protestant side, the antagonism to Calvinism. Strict Lutheranism is merely intermediate between these two, historical, rather than ideal or material. See for the Reformed view, also, *Schneckenburger*, in Orthodoxe Lehre von dem doppelten Stande Christi nach luth. u. ref. Fassung, 1848, and his dissertations in the Stud. u. Krit., 1847, and in the Theol. Jahrb. (Tübingen), 1848; also in his posthumous Vergleichende Darstellung, d. ref. u. luth. Lehrbegriffs, 1855, and *Schweizer's* review of the latter work in the Theol. Jahrb., 1856.]

§ 213.

[RELATION OF THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES IN THE PRESENT PERIOD TO THAT OF FORMER PERIODS. (SYMBOLISM.)

Compare Vol. i. § 4, 13, 16. Note 9.

The important events which occurred during the present age, the introduction of new relations affecting the whole development of the church, the division of Christendom into two great sections—viz., the *Protestants* and the *Roman Catholics*, the separation between the *Lutherans* and the *Calvinists* (the Reformed Church), which took place at an early period, and the abiding schism between the Roman Catholic and the Greek Orthodox churches, render it necessary to adopt another method in the treatment of the history of doctrines. We shall have to consider the dogmatic development of each of these great sections of the church separately, as well as the relation in which they stand to each other. Nor must we pass over those religious parties, which made their appearance in the commotion of those times, and did not join any of the larger bodies, but set themselves in opposition to each and all of them, and were looked upon by them as heretical. And here, too, is found the determining element, which gives a new shape to the History of Doctrines, so that in its flow it is expanded into the form of Symbolism.

I. THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

§ 214.

LUTHER AND MELANCTHON.

Pfizer, *G.*, Leben Luthers. Stuttg., 1846 (together with the other biographical works, both ancient and modern, by *Spieker*, *Meurer*, *Jürgens*, *Gelzer*, etc. See the Church Histories of *Huse* and *Gieseler*.) *J. G. Planck*, Gesch. d. Entstehung, Veränderung u. Bildung des Prot. Lehrbegriffs. Lpz., 1791–1800, vii. Bde. *Ph. Marheineke*, Gesch. d. deutschen Reformation bis 1555, iv. Bde., Berlin, 1831, *sq.* *L. Ranke*, deutsche Gesch. im Zeitalter d. Reform., v. Bde., Berl., 1839–43. [English version, by Sarah Austin, republ. in Phil., 1844; VI. Books.] *Dieckhoff*, Luther's evang. Lehrgedanken, in Deutsche Zeitschrift, Berl., Mai, 1852. [*Weisse*, Die Christologie Luther's, 1858. *C. F. G. Held*, De Opere Jesu Christi salutari quid M. Lutherus senserit demonstratur, Götting. 1860. *Hare's* Mission of the Comforter, Appendix, on Luther's views against Sir Wm. Hamilton, 1855: see Brit. and For. Quarterly, 1856. Luther's Lehre von d. Gnade, in Theol. Zeitschrift, 1860. *H. Vorreiter*, Luther's Ringen mit d. anti-christl. Princip d. Revolution, 1860. Other biographies of Luther by *Audin* (Rom. Cath.) 2. Paris, 1841, (six editions), transl., Phil., 1841: by *Michelet*, Paris, 1845, transl., New York, 1846: *Döllinger's* sketch, 1851, transl., Lond., 1851: *J. E. Riddle*, Lond., 1837: *J. Scott*, N. Y. ed., 1853: *Henry Worsley*, 2. 8vo., Lond., 1856–7. *Rosseeuw St. Hilaire*, Life and Labors of Luther, trans. from Rev. Chrétienne, in Brit. and For. Ev. Rev., Jan., 1841. *Chs. de Rémusat*, in Revue des deux Mondes, 1854. *Bunsen*, in the Edinburgh Encyel., 8th ed. Köstlin in Herzog's Realencycl. Comp. *Merle d'Aubigné*, Hist. Reform., 5 vols., Paris, 1835, *sq.*, Edinb. and New York, in various editions. In the projected Leben und Schriften der Väter der lutherischen Kirche, Luther by *Schneider*, 2 Bde.]

Melancthon.—F. Galle, Versuch einer Charakteristik Melancthons, 1840. [*A. H. Niemeyer*, Mel. als Præceptor Germaniæ, Halæ, 1817: *Matthes*, Altenb., 1841: *C. E. Ledderhose*, Life of Mel., transl. by *Krotel*, New York, 1854: Life, by *Cox*, Lond. and Bost., 1835. *Nitzsch*, in Deutsche Zeitschrift, 1855. *J. E. Volbeding*, Mel. wie er leibte und lebte., 1860. J. F. T. Wohlfarth, Zum Secular-Andenken, 1858. *Planck*, Mel. Præceptor Germ., 1860. C. *Schlottman*, De Phil. Mel. reipubl. litt. Reform., Bonn, 1860. Orations by Dorner, Saupp, and Gündert in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol. 1860. Richard Rothe's Address, transl. by E. N. White, in Am. Theol. Rev., 1861. Life of Mel. by *C. Schmidt*, in the proposed work, Leben d. Väter d. luth. Kirche.]

It may be said, on the one hand, that *Dr. Martin Luther* became emphatically *the* Reformer of the German Church, and thus the reformer of a great part of the universal church, by his grand personal character, and heroic career,[1] by the publication of his theses,[2] by sermons and expositions of Scripture,[3] by disputations and bold controversial writings,[4] by numerous letters and circular epistles, by memorials and judgments on controverted points,[5] by intercourse with persons of all classes of society, by pointed maxims and hymns,[6] but especially by his translation of the Sacred Scriptures into the German language.[7] On the other hand, it was the work of the calmer and more learned *Philip Melancthon* to conduct the mighty stream of the newly awakened life of faith into a circum-

scribed channel. In addition to many other valuable theological works, he composed the first compendium of the doctrines of the Protestant Church (Loci Communes sive Theologici), which formed the basis of other treatises.[1]

[1] He was born at Eisleben A. D. 1483, Nov. 10th.—In the year 1507 he enters the monastery of the Augustinian monks at Erfurt, removes in the following year to Wittenberg, where he teaches first philosophy, and afterwards theology, makes a journey to Rome, 1510, and takes his degree of doctor of theology, 1512.—Publication of the theses 1517, Oct. 31st.—Luther is summoned before the Pope—has an interview with Cajetan in Augsburg, 1518, Oct.—Interview with Miltitz—Controversy with Eck, Wimpina, and others.—Dispute of Leipsic, 1519, June—Excommunication of Luther, 1520.—He burns the bull and the papal decrees 1520, Dec.—Diet of Worms under the Emperor Charles V.—Luther's defence on that occasion (1521, April.)—He is outlawed, and constrained to take up his abode in the Wartburg (from May 1521 to March 1522.)—He leaves his place of concealment to oppose the prophets of Zwickau.—Further spread of the Reformation in Germany, commencing at Wittenberg.—The war of the peasantry, controversy concerning the sacraments, Luther's marriage (1524–1525.)—Visitation of the churches, 1527.—Diet of Augsburg, 1530.—Luther's residence in Coburg—A period of manifold sufferings and vexations.—His death 1546, Febr. 18th.—*Complete editions of his works are:* that of Wittenberg, twelve volumes in German (1539–59), and seven volumes in Latin (1545–58); that of Jena, eight volumes in German (1555–58), and four in Latin (1556–58), in addition to which two supplementary volumes were published by Aurifaber. Eisleben 1564, 65; that of Altenburg, in ten volumes in German (1661–64); that of Leipsic, in twenty-two volumes (1729–40); and lastly, that of Halle, edited *by Walch*, in twenty-four volumes (1740–50). See *Gieseler*, iv. p. 9, and *Rot rmund, H. W.*, Verzeichniss der verschiedenen Ausgaben der sämmtlichen Schriften Luthers. Bremen, 1813. 8. [Luther's Sämmtliche (Deutsche) Werke, herausg. J. K. Irmischer, 67 Bde., Frankf. a. m., completed, 1856; L.'s Exegetica Opera Latina, curavit H. Schmidt, 22 vols. to 1860, Francof.]—Luther did not compose a system of doctrinal theology, but others compiled it from his writings. This was done *e. g.* by *Heinrich Majus*, Professor in Giessen, who wrote: Lutheri Theologia pura et sincera, ex Viri divini Scriptis universis, maxime tamen Latinis, per omnes fidei Articulos digesta et concinnata. (Francof. ad. M. 1709, with a supplement.) Similar works were composed by Timoth. *Kirchner*, Andr. *Musculus*, Theodos. *Fabricius*, Michael *Neander* (Theologia Megalandri Lutheri. Eisl. 1587. 12), Elias *Veiel*. See Semler, Einleitung zu Baumgarten's Glaubenslehre ii. p. 146. *Heinrich*, Geschichte der Lehrarten, etc., p. 248.

[2] They are given in *Löscher's* Reformationsacten, i. p. 438, ss., and *Herm. von der Hardt*, Historia Reformat. Litt. P. iv. p. 16. Compare also *Gieseler*, Church Hist. iv. p. 19, note, where the most important theses may be found. "*The whole life of believers on earth is to be one of unceasing repentance; this is the sum and kernel of these theses, and of evangelical Protestantism.*" *Schenkel*, Die Reformatoren, s. 24.

[3] For an account of the different collections of sermons, homilies, etc. (Kirchen- und Hauspostill, etc.) see *Lentz*, Geschichte der christlichen Homiletik, ii. pp. 22, 23.—His exegetical works (*e. g.* his commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, 1535–38), are of use in the history of doctrines.

[4] The several controversial writings which he composed in opposition, both to the advocates of the old system, and to the real or supposed corrupters of the new doctrines, as well as the reports of public disputations, will be specified in their proper connexions in the special history of doctrines.

[5] Briefe, Sendschreiben und Bedenken, edited by de Wette, five volumes, Berlin, 1825–28; Vol. vi., ed. *Seidemann*, 1856. (Comp. the chronological table of de Wette, prefixed to these Epistles, with that in note 1, above.)

[6] *Gebauer*, Luther als Kirchenliederdichter. Leipzig, 1828. The latest edition appeared under the care of Winterfield, 1840. Luther's maxims are for the most part collected in the "Tischreden" (*i. e.* Table-talk), published by Aurifaber. An edition of the Tischreden, by *Förstemann* and *Bindseil*, 1844–48. [A translation, with Life, by *A. Chalmers*, in Vol. 127 of Bohn's Standard Library, London.]

[7] The translation of the Bible was commenced during his residence in the Wartburg, and that of the New Testament was completed, 1522. The first German translation of the whole Bible was published by Hans Lufft in Wittenberg, A. D. 1534 (compare the editions of 1541. 45.) Further particulars will be found in *Panzer*, *G. W.*, Entwurf einer vollständ. Geschichte der Bibelübersetzung Dr. M. Luthers. Nürnb. 1783. 8, and the other works on this subject written by *Marheineke*, *Weidemann*, *Lücke*, *Schott*, *Grotefend*, and *Mann* (Stuttgart, 1835.) Compare *Gieseler*, iv. 65, note. *Höpf*, on this translation, 1847.

[8] His original name was *Schwarzerd;* he was born at Bretten, in the Palatinate, 1497, Febr. 16th; and delivered lectures in the university of Wittenberg. He was surnamed *Præceptor Germaniæ*. His lectures on Paul's Epistle to the Romans gave rise to his celebrated work: Loci Communes Rerum Theologicarum seu Hypotyposes Theologicæ.* 1521 in 4to. In the same year it was also published in 8vo; it has passed through upwards of a hundred editions, more than sixty of which appeared during his lifetime. The Loci were several times improved, and from the year 1550 published under the title: Loci Præcipui Theologici. Comp. *Herm. von der Hardt*, Hist. Reform. Litter. P. iv. p. 30, ss. One of the best of the late editions is that of **Augusti*, Lips. 1821. *H. Balthasar*, Historia Locorum Phil. Melanc. Gryphisw. 1761.—Luther (De Servo Arbitrio) called the work: invictum libellum, non solum immortalitate, sed canone etiam ecclesiastico dignum. Compare the passage quoted from his "Tischreden" by *Galle*,

* On the signification of the word Locus, see *Heppe*, Dogmatik des deutschen Protestant. s. 6. By the *Loci* are meant the proper *δόγματα*, the sedes doctrinæ. [The classical sense of *τόπος*, locus, is, a principle: Cicero speaks of *loci*, "quasi sedes, e quibus argumenta promuntur." The Loci Communes are the fundamental ideas or truths of theology. Melancthon says, that his Hypotyposes are wholly different from the Sententiæ of Peter Lombard: they are not a system, but rather an introduction to the study of the Scriptures. *Heppe*, u. s.]

p. 20. *Strobel*, Litterargeschichte von Phil. Melancthon's Locis Theologicis Altdorf und Nürnberg 1776. 8. Concerning other doctrinal and polemical writings of Melancthon, see *Heinrich*, l. c. p. 268, ss. *Galle*, l. c. *Bretschneider*, Corpus Reformatorum T. i.—xxviii. *Schwarz*, Melancthon's Loci nach ihrer weiteren Entwicklung (Stud. u. Kritik., 1857, s. 297 : cf. ibid., 1855. *Gass*, Gesch. d. Prot. Dogmatik, 23. *Heppe*, Dogmatik des deutschen Protest. s. 9, *sq.* *Bretschneider*, Corpus Reformat. xxi. and xxii. (a critical collection of the different editions by Bindseil.) [The edition of Melancthon's works, projected by Bretschneider in his Corpus Reformat. was brought to its completion in 1860, by the publication of the 28th vol., edited by *H. E. Bindseil*. An edition of the *Loci*, after that of 1559, Berlin, 1856 ; a reprint of the edition of 1521, edited by M. I. E. Volbeding, Leipz., 1860.]

§ 215.

THE SYMBOLICAL BOOKS OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

On the literature compare vol. i. § 13, p. 30, and § 16, p. 42. [*H. Heppe*, Die Bekenntnisschriften der altprotestantischen Kirche Deutschlands, Cassel, 1855.]

Melancthon was chosen by the newly formed Protestant church to draw up a confession of faith in a concise, clear, and pacific form, on the basis of those doctrines which he, with Luther and other divines, agreed in receiving. From its solemn presentation at the diet of Augsburg (A. D. 1530), it received the name of the *Confession of Augsburg* (Confessio Augustana.)[1] The *Confutatio*, published by the Roman Catholics, in opposition to the Confession of Augsburg,[2] gave rise, soon after, to a new symbolical book of the Lutheran Church, the *Apology of the Confession*, of which Melancthon was the sole author.[3] The *Articles of Smalcald* (A. D. 1536–37), composed by Luther, in much bolder terms, followed somewhat later.[4] These completed the series of official documents and apologies, which bore upon the external relations of the new church.[5] But in order to establish the internal relations of the Protestant Church on a firm doctrinal basis, the two *Catechisms of Luther* were added to the collection of symbolical books as normal compendiums.[6] And lastly, in consequence of many and violent controversies respecting the fundamental principles of Protestantism, which arose within the Lutheran Church itself,[7] it was found necessary, after various but unsuccessful attempts to restore peace, to draw up the *Formula Concordiæ*, (*Germ.* Concordienformel A. D. 1577), in which the disputed points were considered, and, as far as possible, determined.[8] All these books were now collected into a symbolical canon (A. D. 1580), the *Liber Concordiæ* (*Germ.* Concordienbuch). In the course of time this canon acquired such high

authority, that the clergy had to subscribe it as solemnly as Scripture itself.[9]

[1] Confessio Augustana, on the basis of the seventeen articles of Torgau (Schwabach), composed by order of the Prince Elector of Saxony by Luther, Jonas, Bugenhagen, and Melancthon. The original edition was published in German and Latin, A. D. 1530 by *G. Rhaw* (in modern times it has been edited by *Winer*, 1825, *Tittmann*, 1830, *Twesten*, 1840, 1850, *Francke*, 1846), new edition by *Heppe*, Kassel, 1855. [Müller, 1848.] It consists of twenty-eight articles; in the first twenty-one the principal doctrines (Articuli fidei præcipui) are discussed with reference to the Roman Catholic doctrines, but in moderate terms; the last seven treat of the abusus mutatos. Further particulars (of its literary history) are given by *Winer*, Comparative Darstellung, p. 13. *Gieseler*, Church History, iv. p. 139, 243, ss. Many details respecting its origin, and the elevation of mind of its confessors, will be found in the work of *Rotermund*, Geschichte des Reichstages in Augsburg. Hanover, 1829. Concerning the critical part see *Weber*, Geschichte der Augsburgischen Confession. Frankf., 1783, 84, ii. *Förstemann*, Urkundenbuch, Halle, 1833., 35. *Rudelbach*, A. G., historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Augsburgische Confession. Dresden, 1841. On the relation of the *Variata* edition of 1540 (considered as the more complete and enriched (locupletirte) edition) to the *invariata*, see *Heppe*, Die confessionelle Entwicklung der altprotestantischen Kirche Deutschlands, Marb., 1854, s. 110, *sq.* [English translation of the Augsb. Confession, Rev. *W. H. Teale*, Lond., 1842. Its articles are also translated in *P. Hall*, Harmony of Confessions, Lond., 1842. On the *Variata*, see *Gieseler*, Church Hist., iv. § 36, note 33. The Augsburg Confess. in its original and revised forms in *Heppe*, Die Bekenntnisschriften, s. 7–107, 337–407.]

[2] It was composed by a number of Roman Catholic theologians (among whom were *Eck* and *Faber*), and read aloud (in German) in the Diet, 1530, Aug. 3d, but no copy of it was communicated to the Protestant estates. It was only afterwards that Melancthon obtained a copy. It is reprinted in *Hase*, Libri Symbolici, p. 55, ss. (ed. 5th.)

[3] The first sketch of the Apology was composed from memory of what was contained in the *Confutatio*, as the author had no copy of the writing of his opponents, and presented to the Emperor Charles V., A. D. 1530, Sept. 22d. It was afterwards revised, after Melancthon had seen the Confutatio, and published 1531, both in Latin and German, together with the Confession of Augsburg. The same arrangement is adopted in the Apology as in the Confession, but the number of articles is reduced to 16. "*With regard to its intrinsic worth, this work, no doubt, occupies the first place among the symbols of the Lutheran Church.*" *Winer*, p. 16. Even *Ernesti* called it "*a masterpiece* in the argument *ex dictis Scripturæ, ex natura rerum*, and *consensu patrum*," etc. See *Ernesti*, neue theologische Bibliothek, vol. ii. p. 413. It was edited by *Lücke*, in Latin and German, Berl., 1818. [*Heppe*, ubi supra, 107–307.]

[4] These were drawn up in German, in order to be presented at the council summoned by Pope Paul III. (A. D. 1536), and signed by the assembly of

Smalcald (1537, Feb.) The first German edition appeared at Wittenberg 1538. They were republished from a MS. in the Library of Heidelberg by Dr. *Phil. Marheineke*, Berl., 1817, 4°.—The work consists of three parts 1. de summis articulis divinæ majestatis; 2. de summis articulis, qui officium et opus Jesu Christi s. redemtionem nostram concernunt; 3. articuli, de quibus agere potuerimus cum doctis et prudentibus viris vel etiam inter nos ipsos. (An appendix was afterwards added of Melancthon's treatise, De Potestate et Primatu Papæ.)—The relation of the polemic element to the irenic is here different from what it is in the Augsburg Confession. Here the polemical preponderates. On the question, whether those Articles had from the first symbolical authority, see *Heppe*, Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantimus, s. 106. [*Heppe*, Bekenntnisschriften, 317–337.]

[e] On the distinction between those symbolical writings which have regard to *external* relations, and those which refer to *internal* relations, see *Schleiermacher*, über den eigenthümlichen Werth und das Ansehen symbolischer Bücher, in the Reform. Almanach. Vol. ii. 1819, p. 235, ss. [For the Confessio Saxonica, Confessio Würtembergica, the Frankfort Recess, and the Naumburg Repetition of the Augsburg Confession, see *Heppe*, ubi supra.]

[f] In the year 1529, Luther wrote both the Catechismus major (for the use of the clergy and schoolmasters) and the Catechismus minor (for the use of the people and children), not in order to force a system of doctrines upon the church, but to supply a practical deficiency. Both were divided into five leading parts. On the different editions, appendices, etc., see Winer, l. c. p. 16. **Augusti* Einleitung in die beiden Hauptkatechismen der evangelischen Kirche. Elberfeld, 1824. *Illgen, C. F.*, Memoria utriusque Catech. Lutheri. Lips., 1828–30. 4 Programmes 4to.

[g] The most important of these controversies are the following:—

a. The *Antinomian Controversy;* it originated with *John Agricola* of Eisleben (from the year 1536 he was professor in the university of Wittenberg), during Luther's lifetime. Comp. *Elwert*, de Antinomia J. Agricolæ Islebii. Tur., 1836.

b. The *Adiaphoristic Controversy*, which had its origin in the Interim of Leipsic (from the year 1548), and gave rise to a lasting difference between the more moderate views of Philip Melancthon, and the more rigid doctrines of the orthodox Lutherans. The former view was represented by the university of Wittenberg, the latter by that of Jena. [*Gieseler*, iv. 457, *sq.*] This difference manifested itself especially in

c. The *Controversy* between *George Major* and *Nicolas Amsdorf*, concerning the question, whether good works are necessary to salvation, or whether they rather possess a dangerous tendency (about the year 1559, ss.) This controversy was connected with the two following—viz.

d. The *Synergistic Controversy* respecting the relation in which human liberty stands to divine grace; it was called forth (A. D. 1555) by the treatise of *John Pfeffinger:* De libero Arbitrio, which was combated by *Amsdorf.* [*Gieseler*, iv. 444, 445.]

e. The *Controversy* respecting the nature of original sin, between *Victorin Strigel* (in Jena,) and *Matthias Flacius.* It commenced A. D. 1560, and led to the disputation of Weimar, A. D. 1561. *Twesten*, Matthias Flacius Illyricus, Berlin, 1844. [*W. Preger*, Matth. Flac. Illyricus und seine Zeit. Erlang., 1859. *Gass*, Prot. Dogm. i. 56, *sq.*] About the same time a controversy was carried on in Prussia—viz.

f. The *Controversy* between *Andrew Osiamder* (in Königsberg) and *Joachim Mörlin*, *Francis Stancarus*, etc.; it bore upon the relation in which justification stands to sanctification, and to the main point in the work of redemption. Comp. Tholuck, literarischer Anzeiger, 1833, No. 54, ss. [Comp. *Gieseler*, iv. 469. *A. Ritschl*, Die Rechtfertigungslehre Osianders, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1857. *Baur*, Brevis Disquisitio de Andr. Osiandr., 1831. *Heberle*, in Stud. u. Kritik., 1844. *Wilken*, Osianders Leben, i. 1844. *F. H. R. Frank*, De Satisf. Christi....ex lite Osiandr. Erlang., 1858. *B. F. Grau*, De Andr. Osiandri Doctrina, 1860. Life of Osiander, by Lehnerdt, in the projected Leben d. Väter der lutherischen Kirche, Bd. v.]

g. The (*Cryptocalvinistic*) *Controversy* concerning the Lord's Supper: *First*, In the Palatinate between *W. Klebitz* and *Tileman Hesshus* (A. D. 1559.) In consequence of it, not only were both these pastors dismissed, but Frederic III., Prince Elector of the Palatinate, also went over to the Reformed Church. [*Gieseler*, iv. 447–457.] *Secondly*, The controversy which took place in Bremen between *Albrecht Hardenberg* and the said *Hesshus* (A. D. 1561), together with its consequences. *Thirdly*, The controversy carried on in Saxony itself. There *Casper Peucer*, the son-in-law of Melancthon, succeeded in gaining over the Prince Elector Augustus, as well as Crell and others, to the Calvinistic doctrine (Consensus Dresdensis), until the former, having obtained a better knowledge of the real state of things by the Exegesis perspicua Controversiæ de Cœna Domini, in which the views of Peucer's party were more distinctly set forth, commenced a bloody persecution of the Cryptocalvinists, and adopted measures for the restoration of Lutheran orthodoxy.

On all these controversies compare the works on ecclesiastical history, and the history of the Reformation, as well as the well-known works of *Walch*, *Planck*, etc. They will be considered in the special history of doctrines. *Gass*, Gesch. d. Prot. Dogmatik, i. 56. [*Gieseler*, Church History, Vol. iv. § 37–42.]

[8] The Formula Concordiæ was based upon the articles drawn up in Torgau (1576.—Torgauisches Buch), and composed in the monastery of Bergen near Magdeburg (1577), by *Jacob Andreæ* (Schmidlin), chancellor of Wirtemberg, on the one hand, and the Saxonian theologians, *Martin Chemnitz*, *Nicolas Selnecker*, *David Chytraeus*, *Andrew Musculus*, and *Christopher Körner*, on the other. It was called the "Bergisches Buch," and acquired symbolical authority, not only in Saxony, but also in other towns and countries, while it met with opposition in Hesse, Anhalt, Pomerania, and several of the free cities. In Brandenburg and upper Palatinate it was first adopted, but afterwards lost its reputation. [See *Gieseler*, iv. 487.]—The Formula

consists of two parts: 1. The shorter one, Epitome; 2. The longer one, Solida Declaratio. It was originally published in German, and translated into Latin by L. Osiander. Comp. *Nicholas Anton*, Geschichte der Concordienformel. Leipzig, 1779, ii. 8. *Planck*, vi. [*K. F. Göschel*, Die Concordienformel, Gesch., Lehre, etc., Leipsic, 1858. *H. Heppe*, Gesch. d. Conc. Form., 1857. *F. H. R. Frank*, Die Theologie der Concordienformel, 1858. *J. G. Martens*, (Rom. Cath.) Die Form. Concord., 1860. *Kollner's* Symbolik. *Gieseler's* Church Hist. iv. § 40.]

[9] The German title of it is: "Concordia, christliche, wiederholte, einmüthige Bekenntniss nachgenannter Churfursten, Fürsten und Stände Augsburgischer Confession und derselben zu Ende des Buchs unterschriebenen Theologen Lehre und Glaubens, mit angehefter, in Gottes Wort, als der einigen Richtschnur, wohlgegründeter Erklärung etlicher Artikel, bei welchen nach Dr. Martin Luthers seligen Absterben Disputation und Streit vorgefallen. Aus einhelliger Vergleichung und Befehl obgedachter Churfürsten, Fürsten und Stände derselben Landen, Kirchen, Schulen und Nachkommen zum Unterricht und Warnung in Druck verfertigt." Dresden, 1580, fol. [Transl. by *A. Henkel*, New Market, Va., 1854.]

§ 216.

THE SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

Buddei, Isagoge (Lips. 1727), i. p. 387, ss. *Walchii* Bibliotheca Theologica selecta, i. p. 33, ss. *Semler*, Einleitung in die dogmatische Gottesgelehrsamkeit (the introduction to Baumgarten's Glaubenslehre, vol. ii. iii.) *Heinrich*, Geschichte der Lehrarten der protestantischen Kirche, p. 271, ss. [*Heinr. Schmid*, Dogmatik der evang. Luther, Kirche 4te Aufl., 1858.] *De Wette*, Dogmatik der protestantischen Kirche edit. 3d, p. 17, ss. *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, oder Dogmatik der evangel. lutherischen Kirche [8th ed., 1855]. *A. Tholuck*, Der Geist der lutherischen Theologen Wittenbergs im Verlaufe des 17. Jahrhunderts, Hamb., 1852. [Tholuck, Das akadenische Leben d. 17, Jahrhund. 2te Abtheilung, 1854: Lebenzeugen, 1856.] **W. Gass*, Gesch. d. Protest. Dogmatik, 2 Bde., Berl., 1854–7. Comp. § 212. [*Heppe*, Gesch. d. deutschen Protest. 4 Bde., 1853–9. *Gieseler*, Church Hist. iv. § 48. *A. Schweizer*, Die Protest. Centraldogmen, 2 Bde., Zurich, 1854. *Elrard*, Dogmatik, i. 6, *sq.*, translated in Mercersburg Review, April, 1857. *Twesten* Dogmatik, i. 228–273.]

Many works on systematic theology were published by different writers; some of whom, such as *Martin Chemnitz*,[1] *Victorin Strigel*,[2] and *Nicholas Selnecker*,[3] followed Melancthon; while others, *e. g. Leonhard Hutter*,[4] *John Gerhard*,[5] *Jacob Heerbrand*,[6] *Matthias Haffenreffer*,[7] and others, adopted the strict Lutheran view, and closely adhered to the Formula Concordiæ. These works were, for the most part, called *Loci Theologici*, and arranged after the synthetic method.[8] But after *George Calixt*[9] had separated ethics from systematic theology, and applied the analytic method of investigation to the latter,[10] *John Hülsemann*,[11] *John Conrad Dann-*

hauer,[12] *Abraham Calov,*[13] *John Fr. König,*[14] *John Andrew Quenstedt,*[15] *John William Baier,*[16] [*David Hollaz,*[17]] and others, followed more or less the course which he had adopted. These theologians may, in many respects, be compared to the scholastics of the preceding period; though in either case we may show a variety of modifications and transitions.[18]

[1] Chemnitz, born at Treuenbriezen, A. D. 1522, Nov. 9th, was the most learned of the disciples of Melancthon, on whose Loci he delivered lectures in the University of Wittenberg. He took part in the composition of the Formula Concordiæ (comp. § 213), as well as in the reformation of Brunswick. He died 1586.—He wrote; Loci Theologici, edit. Op. et Stud. Polycarp. Lyseri (Leyser.) Francof. 1591, 4to., ibid. 1599, 1604, iii. 8vo, Viteb. 1615, 23, 90, fol.—"*These commentaries are written with a great amount of learning.....Accuracy and clearness in the definition of doctrines, mature judgment, prudent choice of matter and proofs, and order in the arrangement, are everywhere apparent;*" *Heinrich*, p. 274.—Examen Concilii Tridentini, Frankof., 1615, 1707. Concerning the other dogmatic works of Chemnitz, see *Heinrich*, p. 276. [*Heppe*, 119. *Gass*, 51, 70.]

[2] Strigel was born at Kaufbeuren, A. D. 1524, and obtained a professorship of divinity in the University of Jena, A. D. 1548. On the controversy between him and Flacius see the preceding §. He died A. D. 1569, as an exile at Heidelberg. His Loci Theologici were edited, Lab. et Studio *Christ. Pezelii*, Neap. Nemet. (Neustadt on the Hardt), 1582–85, ii. 4. "*In many points he is so profound and edifying, that I am not sure whether any other theologian of that period has surpassed him*;" *Semler*, in his edition of Baumgarten's Glaubenslehre, ii. p. 158.—The work itself is scarce. Comp. Otto, De Victorino Strigelio, liberioris Mentis in Eccl. Luth. Vindice, Jena., 1843.

[3] Selnecker was born A. D. 1530, at Hersbruck in Franconia, studied theology in the University of Wittenberg, was chaplain to the Prince Elector of Saxony, Professor of Divinity in the Universities of Jena and Leipsic, superintendent at Wolfenbüttel, etc., and died A. D. 1592. He also took part in the composition of the Formula Concordiæ. He wrote: Institutiones Christianæ Religionis. Partes iii. Frankof., 1573, 79, 8. This work was the first system of dogmatic theology in the Lutheran Church which contained the so-called Prolegomena (on the Scriptures, revelation, etc.) Comp. *Gass*, 51. *Heppe*, 96.

[4] Hutter was born A. D. 1563, at Nellingen, in the district of Ulm. He was surnamed Lutherus redivivus, and defended the Formula Concordiæ (Concordia Concors. Witeb., 1614, fol.) in opposition to Hospinian (Concordia Discors. Tig., 1607, fol.) By order of Christian II., Prince Elector of Saxony, he wrote: Compendium Locorum Theol. ex Sacra Script. et Libro Concord. collat. Vit., 1610; new edition by *Twesten*, Berl., 1855.—Loci Communes Theol. ex. Sacris Litteris diligenter eruti, Veterum Patrum Testimoniis passim roborati, et conformati ad meth. locc. Mel. Viteb., 1619, 53, 61, ss. While he speaks of Melancthon with high regard, he still charges

him with—defectio a puritate doctrinæ cœlestis. Comp. *Gass*, 251. *Heppe*, 155, *sq.*

[5] Gerhard was born A. D. 1582, at Quedlinburg, occupied a chair of divinity in the University of Jena, and died 1637, Aug. 17th. He wrote: Loci Theol. cum pro adstruenda veritate, tum pro destruenda quorumvis contradicentium falsitate, per theses nervose, solide et copiose explicati. Jenæ, 1610–25, ix. Voll. 4.· Denuo edid. variique gen. obss. adjec. J. Fr. *Cotta*. T. i.–xx. Tub., 1762–89, 4.—Exegesis s. uberior Explicatio Articulorum de Scriptura S. de Deo et de Persona Christi in Tomo I. Locorum (Cotta T. ii. iii.)—*J. E. Gerhard*, Isagoge Loc. Theol. in qua ea, quæ in ix. Tomis uberius sunt exposita, in Compendium redacta, Jen., 1658.—See *Heinrich*, p. 314, ss. *Semler*, p. 72, ss. *Gass*, 259, *sq.*

[6] Hœrbrand was Chancellor in Tübingen, died 1600. His Comp. Theol. Tüb., 1573 (ed. by Crus. Wittenb., 1582), had almost symbolical authority in Würtemberg. See *Gass*, 77, *sq.* *Heppe*, 124, *sq.*

[7] Haffenreffer was born 1561, and died 1619, as Provost, in Stuttgard. His Loci Theologici (Tübingen, 1691, frequently republished), "*obtained at once the widest currency in upper and lower Germany, because it gave in the most precise and intelligible manner the doctrinal points of the Formula Concordiæ, which was what they wanted to hear exclusively in the Lutheran lecture-rooms;*" *Heppe*, i. 129. *Gass*, 78, *sq.*

—Besides these divines, may also be named, *Nicolas Hemming*, *Abdias Prætorius*, *John Wigand;* and later (in seventeenth century), *Erasmus Brachmand* (Universæ Theologiæ Systema, etc., Hafniæ, 1633, 2 Tom. 4to), *Bircherod*, *Friedlieb*, etc. See *Semler*, p. 71, 80. *Heinrich*, p. 283, 328. *Gass* and *Heppe*, ubi supra.—On the relation of this aftergrowth (Ἐπίγονοι) to Melancthon, see *Heinrich*, as above, p. 310, *sq.* *Gass*, 80.

[8] The synthetic method starts from the highest principle, God, and proceeds to Man, to Christ, to Redemption, till it comes down to the end of all things.

[9] Of his writings the following are of a doctrinal character: Apparatus in Theol. Stud., ed. *F. U. Calixt.* Helmst., 1656, 1661. Epitome Theol. Gosl., 1619, ed. *Gerh. Titius*, 66. Epit. Theol. Mor. Helmst., 1634. For further particulars see below, § 218. On his analytic method compare *Heinrich*, pp. 330, 331. *Gass*, 303, *sq.**

[10] The analytic method begins with the end or final cause (the "final method") of all theology, blessedness; and hence takes the opposite course from the synthetic. On other, complicated methods, see *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 41, *sq.* *Gass*, p. 47.

[11] Hülsemann was born A. D. 1602, at Esens in East Friesland; held several situations in Saxony, was superintendent at Meissen, and died A. D. 1661, —He wrote: Breviarium Thologicum. Viteb., 1640, 8. Extensio Breviarii Theol. Lips., 1648, 55.—*Valent Alberti*, Brev. Theol. Hülsemann. enucl. et auct. Lips., 1687, 4. His opponents called his style; stilum barbarum,

* Under the influence of *Calixtus* were the divines *Joachim Hildebrand*, and *John Heinich* (died 1671): see *Gass*, 311. [On Calixtus, see *Gieseler*, Church Hist. iv. § 52, pp. 584–593. *Henke*, Calixt. u. seine Zeit. 2, 8vo., 1853–60; *Hundeshagen*, in Stud. u. Krit., 1856; Christ. Remembrancer, Lond., 1855.]

scholasticum, holcoticum, scoticum ac tenebrosum. See *Scherzeri* Prolegomena, quoted by *Heinrich*, p. 333. *Tholuck*, Theolog. Wittenb. 164, *sq.* *Gass*, 316.

[12] Dannhauer, born A. D. 1603, at Köndringen, in the county of Baden-Hochberg, was professor of theology in the university of Strassburg, instructed Spener, and died A. D. 1666. "*He had considerable influence, chiefly from his profound exegetical lectures, delivered in a popular style.*" *Hossbach* (Spener. i. p. 17.) He wrote: Hodosophia Christiana s. Theol. Posit. in Methodum redacta. Argent, 1649, 66, 8, Lips., 1713, 4. Spener arranged this work in the form of tables, Franc., 1690, 4. On the so-called phenomenal method which Dannhauer adopted (*i. e.*, the symbolico-allegorical representation of man under the figure of a pilgrim, etc.), see *Hossbach*, l. c. p. 23. *Semler*, p. 85. *Heinrich*, p. 331.—In addition to the above work he composed: Christosophia, 1638, and Mysteriosophia, 1646. See *Gass*, p. 318.

[13] Calov was born A. D. 1612, at Morungen, filled the office of Superintendent at Wittenberg, and died A. D. 1686. He used daily to offer this prayer: Imple me, Deus, odio hæreticorum! He wrote: Systema Locorum Theol. e Sacra potiss. Script. et Antiquitate; nec non Adversariorum Confessione Doctrinam, Praxin et Controversarium Fidei cum veterum tum imprimis recentiorum Pertractationem luculentam exhibens. Vit. 1655–77, 12 Voll. 4. Theol. Positiva per Definitiones, Causas, Adfectiones et Distinctiones Locos Theol. universos.....propouens, seu Compendium System. Theol. Viteb. 1682, 8. See *Tholuck*, ubi supra, 185, and particularly *Gass*, 332, *sq.*

[14] König was born A. D. 1619, at Dresden, and died A. D. 1664, at Rostock, where he was professor of theology. He wrote: Theologia Positiva Acroamatica synoptice tractata. Rost., 1664. An improved edition of it appeared in *J. Casp. Haferungi* Colleg. Thet. Viteb., 1737, 8. According to *Buddeus* (Isagoge, p. 399), it is a mere skeleton of a system of doctrinal theology, without sap or force. But compare *Gass*, 321, who reckons him among the "dogmatic virtuosi."

[15] Quenstedt, born at Quedlinberg, A. D. 1617, was professor of theology in the university of Wittenberg, and died A. D. 1688. He wrote: Theologia Didactico-polemica s. Systema Theol. in duas sectiones.....divisum. Viteb., 1685, and 96, Lips., 1702, 15, fol. Comp. *Semler*, p. 103, ss. *Tholuck*, 214, *sq.* *Gass*, 357, *sq.*

[16] Baier was born A. D 1647, at Nürnberg, and died A. D. 1695, at Weimar, where he was Superintendent. He composed a Compendium Theol. Positivæ. Jen., 1686, 8. An improved edition of it was edited by *Reusch*, 1757. See *Gass*, p. 353. It was founded upon the "Einleitung in die Glaubenslehre," and some shorter doctrinal treatises, composed by *John Musæus* (who died 1681 at Jena.)—Concerning the analytic method adopted by its author, see *Heinrich*, p. 348, ss. *Gass*, ubi supra.

[17] [*David Hollaz*, was pastor at Jacobshagen: died 1730: he wrote Examen Theologicum acroamaticum Universam Theologiam thetico-polemicam complectens, 1707; edited by *Teller*, 1750, with additions.]

[18] As, *e. g.*, the theologians of the school of St. Victor manifested a lean-

ing towards mysticism, so *John Gerhard*, *Dannhauer*, and others, endeavored to combine strict science with practical piety. On the scholasticism of the Lutheran divines in the seventeenth century, see *Tholuck*, Der Geist d. lutherischen Theologen, etc., p. 246, *sq.* On the needful limitation of the notion of "Protestant Scholasticism," ibid. p. 55, *sq.* On the grandeur of the Protestant dogmatic system, see *Gass*, Gesch. d. Prot. Dogmatik, p. 6, *sq.*, who says that it was "*more profound than the theology of the Fathers of the Church, more true and consistent than that of the scholastics, and more scientifically developed and honestly outspoken than the theories of the Roman Catholic Church.*"

§ 217.

LUTHERAN MYSTICISM, THEOSOPHY, AND ASCETICISM.

Baur, Zur Geschichte der Protest. Mystik, in Zeller's Jahrbücher, 1848, 1849. *Noack*, Die christliche Mystik seit dem Reformationszeitalter (see § 153). *Hamberger*, Stimmen aus dem Heiligthum d. christlichen Mystik und Theosophie, Stuttg., 1857. [*R. A. Vaughan*, Hours with the Mystics, 2d ed. 2 vols., 1860. *Gieseler*, Church History, iv. § 50. *Erbkam*, Gesch. der Protest. Secten., Hamb., 1848.]

As the scholasticism of the middle ages had been counterbalanced by mysticism, so the new scholastic tendency of the Lutheran Church, during the present period, was accompanied by a mystical tendency, representing the deeper interests of practical religion. And further, as we had there to distinguish between the mysticism of the sects, and orthodox mysticism (though its advocates spiritualized, and sometimes idealized, the doctrines of the Church, by internal interpretation), so here again we must distinctly separate these two tendencies from each other. Even in the lifetime of Luther, *Andreas Carlstadt*,[1] *Sebastian Frank*,[2] and *John Casper Schwenkfeld*,[3] endeavored (in a manner similar to that adopted by the prophets of Zwickau, and the Anabaptists)[4] to break up the rigid adherence to the letter of Scripture, by a fantastic idealism, and a spiritualizing theology running over into pantheism. In later times, the mystico-theosophic writings of *Theophrastus Paracelsus*,[5] *Valentin Weigel*,[6] and *Jacob Böhme*,[7] on the one hand, exerted a quickening influence, yet on the other, they perplexed the minds of the people, and threatened to destroy the unity of the Church. On the contrary, the more considerate *John Arnd*,[8] and his followers,[9] sought to introduce "*True Christianity*" into all the relations of life, and to revive, by means of godly sentiments and spiritual exercises, the spirit of true religion, which had been buried under a load of scholastic definitions. *J. G. Arnold* was induced, by his preference for mysticism, to undertake the defence of the heretical sects against the sentence which the orthodox passed upon them.[10]

[1] On *Carlstadt*, see *Göbel*, Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt nach seinem

Charakter und Verhältniss zu Luther, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1841, s. 44, *sq.* *Erbkam*, Geschichte der Protestantischen Secten im Zeitalter der Reformation, Hamb., 1848, s. 174, *sq.* **C. F. Jäger*, Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt, Stutt., 1856. *Baur*, ubi supra (Zeller's Jahrb., 1848.) Carlstadt belongs here only in part, for he held more strictly than the rest of the mystics to the letter of Scripture.

[2] Sebastian Frank was born at Donauwörth, in the beginning of the sixteenth century; died in 1545. His chief works are: Weltbuch—Zeitbuch—Encomium Moriæ—Sprüchwörter—Paradoxa. Compare *Wackernagel*, Proben deutscher Prosa, i. s. 319, *sq.* *K. Hagen*, Geist der Reformation und seiner Gegensätze, ii. 314, *sq.* *Schenkel*, Wesen des Protest. i. 136, *sq.* *Erbkam*, loc. cit. 286, *sq.* *Baur*, loc. cit. p. 490, *sq.* "*It is only in the most recent times that the originality of Sebastian Frank has been particularly recognised, and that a place has been assigned him among those men, in whose varying tendencies are found the elements that determine the character of the period of the Reformation.*" [*Hase's* Church History, New York, ed, p. 436.]

[3] Schwenkfeld was born A. D. 1490, at Ossing, in Silesia, and died 1561. (Luther called him Stenkfeld.) Concerning Schwenkfeld and his friend *Valentin Krautwalk*, see *Planck*, v. i. p. 89, ss., and compare special history of doctrines. See also, **G. L. Hahn*, Schweuckfeldii Sententia de Christi Persona et Opere Exposita. Vratislav., 1847. *Erbkam*, 357, *sq.* *Baur*, 502, *sq.* "*With Schwenkfeld we come first into the real sphere of Protestant mysticism; he, if any one of the olden time, is the representative of the Protestant, and especially of the Protestant Lutheran, Mysticism.*" [Comp. especially *Gieseler*, Church Hist. iv. § 33. *Baur's* Dreieinigkeit, iii. 219, 244. *Dorner*, Person Christi, ii. 573, 624. *Niedner's* Gesch. d. Kirche, 673–677.]

[4] See below § 231. *Erbkam*, loc. cit. 479, *sq.*

[5] His proper name was *Philippus Aureolus Theophrastus Bombastus Paracelsus ab Hohenheim;* he was a native of Switzerland, and died A. D. 1541. His works were published at Basle, 1585, ss., xi. 4. Compare *H. A. Preu*, die Theologie des Theophrast. Paracelsus, Berlin, 1837, 8. *M. Carrière*, Philosophische Weltanschauung der Reformationszeit., Stuttg., 1847. [*Gieseler*, Church Hist. iv. 566. *Tennemann's*, Gesch. d. Phil. ix. 205. *Ritter's* Gesch. d. Phil. v. 517; Christl. Phil. ii. 155, *sq.* *Hagenbach*, Vorlesungen über die Reformation, iii. 337, *sq.*]

[6] Weigel was born A. D. 1533, at Hayn, in Misnia, and died 1588, at Tschoppau, where he was a pastor. His writings were not published till after his death—viz., güldener Griff, d. i. alle Dinge ohne Irrthum zu erkennan, 1616. Erkenne dich selbst, 1618. Kirchen und Hauspostill, 1618... Comp. *Arnolds* Kirchen und Ketzerhist. ii. vol. xvii. c. 17. *Walch*, Einleitung in Die Religions Streitigkeiten, iv. p. 1024–1065. *Planck*, Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie, p. 72, ss. *Hagenbach*, Vorlesungen über die Reformation, iii. p. 337, ss. [See also *Gieseler*, Church Hist. iv. 567. *Dorner's* Person Christi, ii. 224. *Baur*, Versöhnungslehre, 463; Dreieinigkeit, iii. 257. *Ritter*, Gesch. d. Philos. vi 77. *Niedner*, Gesch. d. Kirche,

737, *sq.* *L. Pertz*, Der Weigelianismus, in the Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol., 1857.]

[7] Böhme was born A. D. 1575, at Altseidenburg, in Upper Lausatia, and lived at Görlitz, where he was a shoemaker; died 1620. His writings were edited by *Gichtel*, Amstel., 1682, 1730, 6 vol. 8. *Schiebler*, Leips., 1831; 6 Bde. and Stuttg., 1835, *sq.*, 5 Bde., with an account of his life by *Albert Von Franckenberg*. Comp. *Wullen*. J. Böhme's Leben und Lehre, Stuttgard, 1836, 8. By the same: Blüthen aus J. Böhmes Mystik. Stuttg., 1838. *A. E. Umbreit*, Jacob Böhme, Hiedelberg, 1835. *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 558, ss. *Hagenbach*, Vorlesung. über die Reform. l. c. p. 345, ss. *Baur*, Zeller's Jahrb., 1850. *Hamberger*, Die Lehre des deutschen Philosophen J. Böhme, München, 1844. *Carrière*, ubi supra, 609. *Tholuck*, in Zeitschrift f. Christl., Wissenschaft, 1852, No. 25, *sq.* *Auberlen*, in Herzog's Realencyclop. ii. 265, *sq.* [*H. A. Fechner*, Böhme's Leben und Schriften (a prize essay), 1857. *Hegel*, Gesch. d. Phil. iii. 296. *Ritter*, Christl. Philos. ii. 165, *sq.* *A. Peip*, Jac. Böhme, der Vorläufer christlicher Wissenschaft, 1860. Life by Bialloblotzky, in the Penny Cyclopedia. Schaff's Kirchenfreund, 1853. Christian Review, July, 1854. Works transl., 4 vols., fol., Lond., 1764–81. *Ellistone* was the chief translator, and Law proposed another edition; see Law's Animadversions on Dr. Trapp.]

[8] Arndt was born A. D. 1555, at Ballenstädt, in the duchy of Anhalt, suffered much from persecution, filled the office of Superintendent in Celle, and died 1621. He wrote: Vier Bücher vom wahren Christenthum, 1605, often reprinted (which were combated by Luc. Osiander); Paradiesgärtlein voll christlicher Tugenden; Evangelienpostille, and other works. Comp. *Freheri* Theatr. Viror, Eruditione Claror. p. 409. *Tzschirners* Memorabilien iii. 1, Lpzg., 1812. *Hagenbach*, Vorlesungen, etc., l. c. p. 371, ss. *M. Goebel*, Gesch. des christl. Lebens in der rheinisch-westphäl. evang. Kirche, Coblenz, 1852, ii. 464, *sq.* *H. L. Pertz*, De Johanne Arndio. Hanov., 1852, 4to. [*Gieseler*, Church Hist. iv. 573. *O. Wehrhan's* Lebensgesch. Johann. Arndt's Hamburg, 1848. Arndt's True Christ. transl. by *Hoffmann*, Chambersb., 1834.]

[9] *Joach. Lütkemann*, *Heinr. Müller*, *Christian Scriver*, and others. The better class of preachers, and especially the authors of spiritual songs, exerted also a beneficial influence upon the religious belief of the people. Comp. *Hagenbach*, Vorlesungen, p. 163, ss.

[10] Arnold was born A. D. 1665, at Annaberg, and died 1714 at Perleburg, where he was a pastor.—He wrote: Unparteiische Kirchen und Ketzerhistorie, Frankf., 1699, fol. Schafh., 1740, ss., 3 vol. fol.—Wahre Ausbildung des inwendigen Christenthums—erste Liebe—geistliche Erfahrungslehre, and several other treatises. See *Goebel*, as above.

Lutheran mysticism degenerated especially in the case of *Quirinus Kuhlmann* (1651–89), *John George Gichtel* (1638–1710), and his co-laborers *Breckling*, *Ueberfeldt*, etc. Compare *Hagenbach* Vorlesungen, iv. p. 328, ss. These enthusiasts are of no importance in the history of doctrines. [*Hase*, Church History, 508.]

§ 218.

Reforming Tendencies. John Valentin Andreæ, Calixt, Spener, Thomasius.

Not the mystics alone, but also theologians of common sense and sound judgment, having thrown off the yoke of the theology of the schools, united with those of a more pious tendency, for the purpose of reforming the Church. *John Valentin Andreæ* combated with the weapons of satire, and yet with due earnestness, both the corruptions of the schools and the mysticism of his age.[1] *George Calixt*, guided by a spirit of Christian moderation, endeavored to reduce the doctrines necessary to salvation to the Apostles' Creed, and thus, by degrees, to effect a union of the different denominations, but exposed himself, in consequence, to the charge of *Syncretism.*[2] The influence which he exerted upon his age was less positive than that of *Philip Jacob Spener*, whose sermons, writings, and life, were in this respect, of great importance.[3] Proceeding from the central point of Christian experience, and resting on the basis of Scriptural truth which he had practically studied, he equally avoided scholastic subtilty and theosophic fancies, and was animated by the pure and glowing mysticism of the heart alone. He, as well as his followers (the Pietists), were at first attacked with rage and scorn, but nevertheless imparted a most beneficial impulse to their age. He was upheld by the jurist *Christian Thomasius*, who took part in preparing the more enlightened culture of a new century, rather, however, by his scientific and political attainments, than by profound and original views in theology.[4]

[1] Valentin Andreæ was the nephew of Jacob Andreæ (who was one of the authors of the Formula Concordiæ), and died A. D. 1654. On his life, as well as on the sect of the Rosicrucians, who stand in close connection with the history of mysticism, see *Hossbach*, Val. Andreæ und sein Zeitalter, Berlin, 1819; Also, Vita ab ipso conscripta, Berol., 1849 [ed. F. H. Rheinwald. *Niedner's* Gesch. d. Kirche, 740, *sq.* *Pabst*, *Andreæ's* entlarvter Apap., 1827. *Gieseler's* Church History, iv. 569, *sq.*, where is a full account of the "Chymical Marriage of Christian Rosenkreutz," and of the "Fama Fraternitatis." See also, *Guhrauer* in Niedner's Zeitschrift, f. d. hist. Theologie, 1852, Ueber den Verfasser, Sinn und Zweck der Fama Fraternitatis. The Fama and Confessio were republished at Frankfort, 1827. On the Rosicrucians, see *Figuier*, L'Alchimie, Paris, 1854, chap. v. pp. 247–266; Notes and Queries, Vol. vii. viii.

[2] Calixt was born A. D. 1586, in the duchy of Holstein, and was professor of theology in the University of Helmstädt. His works are mentioned § 214, note 7. Compare **Henke*, Calixts Briefe. Halle, 1833. By the

same: die Univ. Helmstädt im 16, Jahrh., Halle, 1833. *Planck*, Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie, p. 90, ss. *G. W. Gass*, Georg Calixt und der Synkretismus, Bresl., 1846. *Schmid Heinr.*, Geschichte der synkretistischen Streitigkeiten in der Zeit des Georg Calixt., Erlang, 1846. *Gass* says, "*Calixt, to a certain extent, wished to maintain a Lutheran Protestantism, but not a Protestant Lutheranism; he sought Protestanism in Lutheranism, but not the converse;*" Gesch. d. Prot. Dogmatik, s. 308. [Comp. *Gieseler*, Church Hist. iv. § 52, pp. 584–593. *Baur*, d. Calixtin. Synkretismus, in the Theol. Jahrb. (Tübing.) Bd. vii. *Henke*, Calixtus und seine Zeit. i. ii. 1, 2, Halle, 1853–60: comp. the Christ. Remembrancer, Lond., 1855. *Schweizer*, Protest. Central-Dogmen. i. 171, ii. 532. *Niedner*, Geschichte d. Christlichen Kirche, 743–7.]

[3] Spener was born A. D. 1635, at Rappoldsweiler, in Alsatia. Strassburg, Frankfort, Dresden, and Berlin, were successively the scenes of his labors. He was a prebendary at Cologne on the Spree, and died 1705. He wrote: Das geistliche Priesterthum., Frankfurt, 1677, 12, and other editions.—Pia Desideria., Francof., 1678, 12.—Theol. Bedenken., Halle, 1700, ss., 4 voll.—Consilia et Judicia Theol. Frankof., 1709, iii. 4.—Letzte Theol. Bedenken., Halle, 1721, iii. 4. *Hossbach*, Spener und seine Zeit. Berlin, 1827, ii. 8.—At the same time *Aug. Herm. Francke* exerted a considerable influence rather on the life of Christians than on systematic theology. Nevertheless the pietistic tendency is of importance in the history of doctrines, on the one hand, because it was indifferent to all scholastic definitions; on the other, because it laid great stress upon the doctrines concerning sin, repentance, etc.; and lastly, on account of the peculiar coloring which it gave to the theology of the evangelical Church. The diligent study of the Bible, which he insisted on, could not but produce good fruit. See *Illyen, C. F.*, Historia Collegii philobiblici., Lips., 1836–40, 3 Progr. [See *Rose* and *Pusey*, on German Rationalism, 1835. *L. Woods*, in Preface to his Translation of Knapp's Christian Theology. *Tholuck*, in Princeton Essays, vol. i. p. 530, *sq.*]

[4] He died A. D. 1728. Comp. *Luden*, Thomasius nach seinen Schicksalen und Schriften, Berlin, 1805.

II. THE REFORMED CHURCH.

§ 219.

ZWINGLE AND CALVIN.

Hundeshagen, Die Conflicte des Zuinglianismus, Lutheranismus und Calvinismus in der Bernischen Landeskirche, Bern., 1842. *Al. Schweizer*, Die Glaubenslehre der Reform. Kirche dargestellt, 2, 8vo., Zürich, 1844–7; *Ibid.*, Nachwort zur Glaubenslehre, in Zeller's Jahrb., 1848; [*Ibid.*, Protestant. Centraldogmen, 2 Bde., Zürich, 1854.] *Baur*, Princip und Charakter des Lehrbegriffs der Ref. Kirche, in Zeller's Jahrb., 1847. *Schneckenburger*, Reform. Dogmatik mit Rücksicht auf Schweizer's Glaubensl., in the Stud. und Kritiken, 1848, 1st and 3d, Heft.; *Ibid.*, Die neueren Verhandlungen betreffend das Princip des Ref. Lehrbegriffs, in Zeller's Jahrb., 1848; [*Ibid.* Zur Kirchlichen Christologie, Neue Bearbeitung, Pforzheim, 1848.] *Ebrard*, Vindiciæ Theol. Reform. Erlangen, 1848. *Al. Schweizer*, Die Synthese des Determinismus und der Freiheit in der Reform. Dogmatik (against Ebrard, in Zeller's Jahrb., 1849). *Ebrard*, Das Verhältniss der Ref. Dogmatik zum Determinismus, Zürich, 1849. *Zeller*, Das Theologische System Zwingli's (Tübing. Jahrb., 1853). *Ch. Sigwart*, Ulrich Zwingli, Stuttg., 1835. *J. G. Schulten*, Die Lehre der ref. Kirche nach ihren Grundsätzen aus den Quellen dargestellt, 3 Aufl. Lpz., 1855. Comp. § 223. [*Zeller*, Charakter des Zwingl. Lehrbegriffs, in Theol. Jahrb., 1857. *Jäger*, in Studien und Kritiken, 1856. *J. W. Röder*, Der Schweizer. Reform. Zwingli. St. Gallen, 1855. *Stahl*, in Luther. Kirche und Union, Berl., 1859, reviewed by Stier and Baxmann in the Deutsche Zeitschrift, Berlin, 1859. *Gieseler*, Church History, iv. § 35. *Heinrich Heppe*, Die Dogmatik der evangel. Reform. Kirche, aus den Quellen Elberfeld, 1861.]

In the Swiss cities of Glarus, Einsiedeln, and Zurich, *Ulric Zwingle* preached the pure evangelical doctrine, and combated the abuses of the Papacy, independently of Luther.[1] In consequence of a difference of opinion concerning the doctrine of the Lord's Supper,[2] which manifested itself as soon as Luther's views became known in Switzerland, Zwingle and the other Swiss reformers were compelled to adopt their own course, and a new Church was formed, along side of the Lutheran, based on peculiarities of its own, in respect to doctrinal matters, as well as in its constitution and mode of worship, called, by way of distinction, the Reformed Church, though it did not receive this appellation until a later period.[3] Zwingle himself propounded the principles of pure evangelical faith in several writings, which may be regarded as the beginning of a systematic theology of the Reformed Church.[4] But it was reserved for the French reformer, *John Calvin*,[5] after the death of Zwingle, to compose the work entitled: *Institutio Religionis Christianæ*, in which those principles were arranged in a system more comprehensive, well-arranged, and connected, than the Loci of Melancthon.[6]

[1] He was born A. D. 1484, Jan. 1st, at Wildhaus, in Toggenburg. Concerning his life, compare the biographies composed by *Oswald Myconius*,

Nüscheler, *Hess*, *Schuler*, *Hottinger* [transl. by *F. C. Porter*, Harrisb., 1856]; *Röder* [der Schweizer Ref. Huldr. Zwingl. St. Gallen, 1856]; *Christoffel*, Ulr. Zwing. Leben und ausgewählte Schriften, Elberfeld, 1857 [transl. by John Cochrane, Edinb., 1858. Life, by Prof. Robbins, in Bibl. Sacra, Andov., vols. viii. xi. *Hess's* Life transl. by Lucy Aiken, Lond., 1812.] His works were edited by *Gualther*, Tig., 1545, ss., 1581, Tom. iv. fol., and by **Schuler* and *Schulthess*, Zwingli's Werke, vol. i. and ii. in German, vol. iii. v. vi. vii. in Latin.—*Leading historical points in the Swiss Reformation during its first period:* 1. Disputation at Zurich (A. D. 1523, Jan. 29th.)—Zwingle's interpretation of the articles, and his reasons.—2. Disputation (Oct. 26th–28th.) Zwingle's treatise entitled: christenliche Yuleitung.—Decree of the magistracy respecting images, the mass, etc.—Final establishment of the Reformation at Zurich. Disputations at Baden (1526) and Berne (1528.)—The Reformation of Berne (*Bernard Haller*, *Sebastian Meier*, and others.)—The Reformation of Basle (1529, *Oecolampadius*.) The war of Cappel.—The death of Zwingle, 1531, Oct. 11th.—For further particulars see *Bullinger*, Reformationsgeschichte herausgeg. von Hottinger and Vögeli. iii. Frauenf., 1838. *J. J. Hottinger*, evangelische Kirchengeschichte, Zurich, 1708, iv. (A new edition by Wirz-Kirchofer was published, Zurich, 1813–19.) *Johannes von Müller*, Geschichte der schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft, fortgesetzt von *J. J. Hottinger*, Vol. 6 and 7. Comp. *Gieseler*, iv. pp 12, 13. The more recent writings on this period, by *Gobel*, *Lange*, *Gaupp*, *Herzog*, *Meyer*, reviewed by *Ullmann*, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1843.

[2] See the special history of doctrines (on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper).

[3] Theologians are still divided on the question, as to what constitutes the peculiarity of the Reformed Church (see § 212, note 3, and the works there referred to). According to *Schweizer*, the principle of the Reformed theology, running through all its doctrinal statements, is to be sought in the attempt to derive all salvation and all that leads it, absolutely from God alone (not from anything created); with which, too, is connected the more urgent emphasis laid on Scripture alone, and the closer relation made between the law and the gospel, in the Calvinistic system (opposition to all paganising, see above § 213). *Baur* sought for this peculiarity in the absoluteness of God. *Schneckenburger* especially urges the Christological element, as the Reformed theology makes the historical side more prominent, and the Lutheran the speculative aspects of Christology (see his Christology, p. 190, note). However it may be with these statements, it is at any rate certain, that the differences, which it is the office of dogmatic science to search out, are entirely subordinate in comparison with the essential and thorough going opposition between Catholicism and Protestantism; and it would only impede the healthful growth of Protestantism, if the undeniable differences should be so exaggerated as to make out an irreconcileable antagonism among Protestants themselves.—While formerly the exact distinction between the Lutheran and Reformed systems was hardly stated, dogmatic acumen is now in danger of running out into subtle refinements. The times recommend holding to that in which they agree. On the shaping of the Reformed theology in distinction from the Lutheran, see *Gass*, s. 82, *sq.*

[4] Luther and the Lutherans called them Sacramentarians, enthusiasts, etc. (afterwards Calvinists). It was in France that the name "religion prétendue reformée" took its rise. [*Heppe*, Ursprung und Geschichte der Bezeichnungen, "Reformirte" und "Lutherische" Kirche, 1859.]

[5] In addition to the polemical writings, sermons, letters, etc., of Zwingle, we may mention as bearing upon systematic theology: Commentarius de Vera et Falsa Religione (it was addressed to Francis I.) Tigur., 1525.—Fidei Ratio, ad Carol. Imp. Tig. 1530, 4. Christianæ Fidei brevis et clara Expositio, ad Regem christ. (ed. Bullinger.) Tig., 1536. On Zwingle's importance as a systematic theologian, see the works of *Zeller* and *Sigwart*; also *Gass*, i. 91.

[6] He was born at Noyon, in Picardy, A. D. 1519, July 10th, and died at Geneva, 1564, May 27th. Concerning his life, see **Henry*, Leben Calvins, Hamb., 1835–45, 4 vol. *Bretschneider*, Bildung und Geist Calvins und der Genferkirche (Reformations-Almanack, 1821). [*Biographies of Calvin: Henry's* Life, transl. by Stebbing, 2 vols., Lond. and N. Y., 1854; *Beza's* Life of C. transl. by *Gibson*, Phil., 1836; *Dyer; T. Smyth*, 1835; *Audin*, (Rom. Cath.) from the French (3d ed. 1845), Louisville; *M. Haag*, in La France Protestante; *Robbins*, in Bib. Sacra, ii., iii.; *Kitto's* Journal, vols. iii., vii.; Deutscher Kirchenfreund, Phil., 1857; Christian Examiner, 1860; New American Encyclopedia. Correspondence, ed. by Bonner, transl., 3 vols., Edinb. and Phil.; Life and Selections from his writings by *Stähelin*, 1861, in Hagenbach's Leben und Schriften der Väter der Reformirten Kirche. British and Foreign Quarterly Review, Edinburgh, 1860.]

[7] Christianæ Religionis Institutio, totam fere pietatis summam, et quicquid est in doctrina salutis cognitu necessarium, complectens: omnibus pietatis studiosis lectu dignissimum opus (the preface was addressed to Francis I). It was composed at Basle, A. D. 1535. Only the edition of 1536 (published in Basle by Thomas Plater) is extant at present as the first: but it was undoubtedly preceded by an anonymous edition written in French (see Henry, i. p. 102, ss.)—The edition of Basle was followed by those of Strasburg (published by Rihelius), 1539 (some copies under the name *Alcuinus*), 1543, 45, and Geneva, 1550, 53, 54.—An entirely new edition appeared, 1559, at Geneva (published by Robert Stephanus), from which the later editions were reprinted. Comp. Henry, l. c. p. 286, ss., and the opinions of *Bretschneider* and *Krummacher*, which he cites. The German translation of Bretschneider appeared 1823, at Elberfeld.—In addition to his Institutio, Calvin composed many other doctrinal and exegetical works, which will be mentioned in the special history of doctrines.—The complete works of Calvin were published, Geneva, 1617, xii. fol. Amst., 1671, (1677), ix. fol. Comp. also the Anecdota edited by Bretschneider, Lips., 1835 (from the library of Gotha). See *Gass*, i. 99. [His whole works, transl., Edbg, 51 vols., completed, 1855. His Institutes, frequent English editions (Allen); Phil. Presb. Board, in 2 vols. New Test. Comm., and Institutes, ed. Tholuck, Halle. A French transl. of the Institutes, reprinted in Paris, 1859; new edition of his Comm. on New Test., in French.]

§ 220.

THE SYMBOLICAL BOOKS OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

Compare the collections mentioned vol. i. § 13. [The collections of *Augusti*, 1828; *Mess*, 1830; *Niemeyer*, 1840; Sylloge Confess., Oxon., 1827. Harmony of Confess., 1586, 1846. E. G. A. Böckell, Bekenntnisschriften, Leipz., 1847. *Heppe*, Die Bekenntnisschriften d. reform. Kirche Deutschlands, 1860. Helvetic Confess., by *Trechsel*, in Herzog's Realencyclopädie.]

The different mode of development of the Reformed Church on the one side, and of the Lutheran Reformation in Germany on the other,[1] accounts for the difference in the character of their symbolical writings. In the case of the Reformed Church they were less complete in themselves, being at first restricted to confessions of faith drawn up by individuals, or in separate localities, and only by degrees coming into general use as representations of the doctrines held by the Church. Nor should we overlook the evident difference between the characters of Zwingle and Calvin.[2] Hence in forming a more precise estimate about the doctrines, it is important to make a distinction between those symbolical writings which were composed *before*, and those *after*, the influence of Calvin was felt.[3] From what has already been said, it follows that we are not to expect a definitely limited number of Calvinistic symbolical writings, inasmuch as only some of them acquired general authority in the Reformed Church, though not all in the same degree; while the importance of others was limited to certain localities,[4] or to individuals,[5] or to certain periods at the expiration of which they lost their authority.[6]

[1] Compare *Hagenbach*, Vorlesungen über Wesen und Geschichte der Reformation ii. p. 98, p. 103, ss. *Schweizer*, ubi supra, s. 7, *sq.* [*Heppe*, Dogmatik d. ref. Kirche.]

[2] As regards his personal character, Zwingle probably had far more of Luther in him than Calvin, while the latter is rather to be compared with Melancthon (at least as regards his scientific attainments and writings). Yet we must not exaggerate the doctrinal differences between Calvin and Zwingle (see the special history of doctrines.) [See the works of *Zeller*, *Stahl*, and *Sigwart*, ubi supra.]

[3] Compare *Winer*, pp. 18 and 19 of his Comp. Darstellung.

[4] *E. g.* the First Confession of Basle. Nor were the Confessions of different countries (such as the Gallicana, Anglicana, Scotica, Belgica, Marchica, etc.), in the first instance, adopted by any but the Protestants of the respective countries, though the principles contained in them were tacitly recognised in other Protestant countries, and sometimes signed by their representatives.

[5] This was the case with the said Fidei Ratio of Zwingle, as well as with his Clara et Brevis Expositio; comp. *Winer*, p. 18. On the other hand, the

private confession of *Bullinger* obtained such authority, as to become the second Confessio Helvetica; the private confession of Guido de Bres stood in the same relation to the Confessio Belgica. See § 222, notes 4 and 9. [Comp. *Niemeyer*, Collectio Confess.]

Thus the Confessio Tetrapolitana, which fell into oblivion, the second Confessio of Basle (the first Confessio Helvetica 1536), the Formula Consensus, and several others; see the subsequent sections.

§ 221.

A. SYMBOLICAL WRITINGS PRIOR TO THE TIME OF CALVIN.

Escher, in the Encyclopædia published by Ersch and Gruber, 2d Section, Vol. v. p. 223, ss. [*Niemeyer*, ubi supra. *Heppe*, ubi supra. *Hall's* Harmony of Confessions; Introduction.]

As early as the Diet of Augsburg, the four cities of *Strasburg*, *Constance*, *Memmingen*, and *Lindau*, in Upper Germany, which were favorably disposed to the doctrines of Zwingle, presented a separate confession of faith, which is on that account called *Confessio Tetrapolitana* (or sometimes Conf. Argentinensis, Suevica);[1] and Zwingle also presented a statement of his faith to the Emperor Charles V.[2] The Church of Basle gave (A. D. 1534) the first public testimony of its evangelical faith by the publication of a creed, which was also adopted in Mülhausen (Confessio Basiliensis I., Mülhausana).[3] The continuance of the controversy respecting the Lord's Supper, and the efforts made by Bucer and others to restore peace, gave rise to the *Second Confession of Basle*, or the *First Confessio Helvetica*, which was drawn up A. D. 1536, signed by various Swiss cities, and transmitted to the Lutheran theologians then assembled at Smalcald.[4]

[1] It was drawn up by *M. Bucer*, and published A. D., 1531, 4to., both in German and Latin. German editions of it also appeared, Neustadt, on the Hardt, 1580, and Zweibrücken (Deux Ponts), 1604, 4to. It consists of 23 articles. The 18th article, concerning the Lord's Supper, differs *but little* from the Confessio Augustana (see the special history of doctrines). Planck, iii. 1, p. 83, ss.—The Latin text is given in the Corpus et Synt., i. p. (215, ss.), 173, ss., and by *Augusti*, p. 327. Comp. Winer, l. c., and *Wernsdorf*, Historia Confess. Tetrapol. Vite., 1721, 4. [Also in *Hall's* Harmony, and *Niemeyer*, pp. 740–770.] The four cities afterwards, at the Schweinfurt Convention, subscribed the Augsburg Confession. See *Heppe*, Confessionelle Entwicklung, 72.

[2] Comp. § 219, note 4. Winer, l. c. [*Niemeyer*, in his collection, gives Articuli sive Conclusiones LXVII. H. Zwinglii, with the Theses Bernenses appended, pp. 3–15; Z.'s Fidei Ratio, pp. 17–35; and his Expositio, pp. 36–77.]

[2] "Bekanntnuss vnsres heyligen Christenlichen Gloubens wie es die kylch zu Basel haldt" (with the motto: Corde creditur ad justitiam, ore autem fit confessio ad salutem. Rom. x.), in 12 articles; it was founded upon a sketch drawn up by Oecolampadius (see *Hagenbach*, Geschichte der Basler Confession. Basle, 1827. Appendix A.); the German copy of it is given, ibid. p. 37, ss., the Latin in Corpus et Synt. i. (93), 72, ss. *Augusti*, p. 103, ss.

[4] It was composed at a synod in Basle, 1536, by theologians deputed by the cities Zurich, Berne, Basle, Schafhausen, St. Gallen, Mülhausen, and Biel (drawn up by H. Bullinger, Oswald Myconius, Simon Grynæus, Leo Judæ, and Casper Grosmann), with the assistance of Bucer and Capito, the delegates from Strasburg.—On the cause and origin of the said confession, see **Kirchofer*, Oswald Myconius, Zurich, 1813, p. 271–316. *Hess*, Lebensgeschichte Heinrich Bullingers, vol. i. p. 199, ss., 217, ss. *Escher*, l. c. On the relation in which it stood to the first confession of Basle, see *Hagenbach*, Geschichte der Basler Confession, p. 67. [*Niemeyer*, pp. 78–122.]

§ 222.

B. SYMBOLICAL WRITINGS UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF CALVIN.

The Church of Geneva having been at first founded upon the basis of the Calvinistic doctrine, independently of the Church of Zurich, was brought into closer connection with it (A. D. 1549) by means of the *Consensus Tigurinus* (which had reference to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper);[1] while the doctrine of predestination, more fully developed by Calvin, was established in the *Consensus Genevensis* (A. D. 1552).[2] But it was not until Frederick III., Prince Elector of the Palatinate, had joined the Reformed Church, that symbols were adopted which bound the Churches more closely together. These were, on the one hand, the *Catechism of Heidelberg* (A. D. 1562), drawn up by *Caspar Olevianus* and *Zacharias Ursinus*;[3] on the other, the *Second Confessio Helvetica*, composed by Bullinger, and published at the request of the Prince Elector, A. D. 1564.[4] The principles contained in them are also set forth more or less distinctly in the other Reformed creeds, *e. g.* in the *Confessio Gallicana*,[5] *Anglicana*,[6] *Scoticana*,[7] *Hungarica* (Czengerina),[8] *Belgica*,[9] the *Confessio Sigismundi* (Brandenburgica, Marchica),[10] the *Catechismus Genevensis*,[11] the *Declaratio Thorunensis*,[12] etc. And lastly, the controversies carried on between the different sections of the Reformed Church (especially concerning the doctrine of predestination),[13] showed the necessity of symbolical definitions similar to those contained in the *Formula Concordiæ* of the Lutheran Church. Such were the *Decrees of the Synod of Dort* (A. D. 1618),[14] and the *Formula Consensus* drawn up in Switzerland.[15]

[1] Consensio Mutua in Re Sacramentaria Ministror. Tigur. et J. Calvini, consisting of 36 articles, in Calvini Opp. viii. p. 648, ss., and in his Tract. Theolog. (Geneva, 1611, Amst., 1667, fol.) It was separately printed, 1554, by Robert Stephan.' *Winer*, p. 19. Comp. *Hess*, Lebensgeschichte Heinrich Bullingers, ii. p. 15–20. *Henry*, Leben Calvins, ii. 473, note and appendix 181. "*Calvin's spirit showed itself in such a way in relation to the Swiss type of theology, and to the German-Lutheran form, that he was able to develop the former, freeing it from what was rude and immature, without merging it in the latter.*" *Gass*, Gesch. d. Prot. Dogmatik, i. 126. [*Niemeyer*, loc. cit. 190–217.]

[2] De æterna Dei Prædestinatione, qua in salutem alios ex hominibus elegit, alios suo exitio reliquit, it. de providentia, qua res humanas gubernat, Consensus pastorum Genevensis ecclesiæ, a J. Calvino expositus. Genev., 1552, 8. (in Opp. vii. 688, ss., and in vol. viii. of the Dutch edition, p. 593, ss.; Tract. Theol., p. 688.) On the (erroneous) statement of *Planck* and *Marheineke*, that this Consensus had also been adopted by the citizens of Zurich, see *Escher*, l. c. *Hagenbach*, Geschichte der Basler Confess. p. 83, and *Winer*, p. 19. *Henry*, ii. 42. [*Niemeyer*, 218–310.]

[3] Its German title is: Christlicher Underricht, wie der in Kirchen und Schulen der churf. Pfalz getrieben wirdt (*i. e.* Christian instruction, as imparted in the churches and schools of the Palatinate). It was also called Catech. Palatinus, the Palatine Catechism. *Joshua Lagus* and *Lambert Ludolph Pithopœus* translated it into Latin. An edition, which contained both the Latin and the German, appeared, Heidelberg, 1563, 8. In later times it was translated into almost all modern languages, and very frequently commented upon: *e. g.*, by *H. Alting*; see the edition of *E. A. Lewald*, Heidelb., 1841. It consists of three principal parts: 1. Concerning the misery of man in consequence of sin; 2. Concerning the redemption from that state; and, 3. Concerning man's gratitude for that redemption. It is divided into 129 questions. (The 80th question concerning the mass was omitted in many editions.) Comp. *Simon von Alpen*, Geschichte und Literatur des Heidelberg Katechismus Frankf. a. M., 1810, 8. *Reinäcker* (in the Allgemeine Encyclopædie 2d sect., 4th part.) *Beckhaus* in Illgens historische Zeitschrift, viii. 2, p. 39, and *Augusti* (see p. 10.) *Seisen*, Gesch. der Reformation in Heidelb. bis zur Abfassung des Heidelb. Katechismus, Bern., 1848. *Sudhoff*, der Heidelb. Kat. Creuznach, 1851; *ibid.*, Fester Grund christ. Lehre, ein Hülfsbuch zum Heidelb. Kat. (drawn up from the German writings of Caspar Olevianus, with dissertations by the author), Frankf. a. M., 1854. [*Niemeyer* gives both the German and the Latin form, pp. 390–461. English version in the Constitution of the Reformed Dutch Church of North America, Appendix, pp. 3–40. The literature of the Heidelb. Catechism, Mercersb. Quarterly, Oct. 1860; on English Versions, ibid., Jan., 1861. In England an edition, 1850, with bibliographical notices by *Rev. A. S. Thelwall.*—*J. W. Nevin*, History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism, Chambersburg, 1847. The Catechism was introduced in various parts of Switzerland (St. Gall., Zurich); in Hungary and Poland; in most of the German Reformed Churches; in the Netherlands, by the Synod of Wesel, 1688, of Dort, 1574 and 1618; in the Dutch

Reformed, and German Reformed Churches of America—of the latter it is the only symbolical book. On *Olevianus* and *Ursinus*, see *Sudhoff*, in Hagenbach's Leben und Schriften d. Väter der reformirten Kirche, Bd. viii. 1857; he shows that this Catechism was on the basis of those of Calvin and à Lasco. On the different early editions of the Catechism, on Qu. 80, etc., see *Niemeyer*, Præfatio, lvii., *sq.*]

[4] Confessio Helvetica Posterior (it was also called: Confessio et Expositio brevis et simplex sinceræ Religionis Christianæ). At the request of Frederick III., Prince Elector of the Palatinate (1564), it was edited by *Bullinger*, first in Latin (1566), and afterwards in a German translation made by the author himself. It has been often republished: by *Kindler*, 1825, 8, and by **O. F. Fritzsche*, Tur., 1839 (with Prolegomena.) Compare *Escher*, l. c. It has 30 chapters. It was sanctioned not only in Switzerland,* but also in Germany (in the Palatinate), and Scotland, as well as by the Polish, Hungarian, and French Reformed churches. It was translated into French by *Theodore Beza*, Geneva, 1566, 8, and by *Cellérier*, ibid., 1819, 8. [*Niemeyer*, pp. 466–536.]

[5] It consisted of 40 articles. It was set forth and sanctioned, under the influence of the preacher Chandieu, by the Synod of Paris, A. D. 1559, presented first to Francis II., A. D. 1560, and afterwards to Charles IX., at Poissy, by Beza, A. D. 1561, and confirmed by Henry IV. and his mother, at the Synod of Rochelle, 1571. A Latin translation of it appeared, 1566. Comp. Corp. et Synt. i. p. (99) 77, ss.; Augusti, p. 110, ss. A shorter Confession in 18 articles was handed in to Henry IV.; see *Henry*, Leben Calvins, iii. 469, note. It is a different work from that which was published at Heidelberg, 1566, 8, under the title: Confession und Kurze Bekanntnuss des Glaubens der reformirten Kirchen in Frankreich (*i. e.* a Creed and short Confession of Faith adopted by the French Reformed Churches), which was intended to be given to Maximilian II., and the estates of the German Empire on the day of election. For further particulars, see Winer, p. 19. [See also, *De Felice*, Histoire des Protestants de la France; transl. by Lobdell, N. Y., 1851; Merle d'Aubigné; *Puaux*, Hist. de la Ref. Franç., Tom. iv. 1860; *Soldan*, Gesch. des Protest. in Frankreich, 2, Leips., 1855.]

[6] Commonly called the XXXIX. (at first XLII.) Articles, drawn up by *Cranmer* and *Ridley* in the reign of King Edward VI. (A. D. 1551), revised in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and confirmed 1562, by a Synod at London. They were originally published under the title: Articuli, de quibus convenit inter Archiepiscopos et Episcopos utriusque Provinciæ, et Clerum universum in Synodo, Londini anno 1562, secundum computationem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, ad tollendam opinionum dissensionem, et consensum in vera rel. firmandum; editi auctoritate serenissimæ Reginæ, 1571. The English edition is given in the *Book of Common Prayer*, the Latin in Corp. et Synt. i. p. (125) 99, ss. Augusti, p. 126, ss. A *Church Catechism* was composed by *John Poinet* (1553) in four sections, by order of King Edward VI. Comp. *Winer*, p. 22. *Marsh*, Bp. [Comparative View of the Churches

* Only in Basle it was not received until a later period: this delay was occasioned by the Crypto-Calvinistic movements of *Sulzer*: see *Hagenbach*, Gesch. d. Confess.

of England and Rome, 1814, 1841.] Germ. transl. by *F. Eichel*, Gramma, 1848. [*Chs. Hardwick*, Hist. of Articles of Religion (documents from 1536 to 1615); new ed., 1859. *Burnet*, *Welchman*, 1692, and *Browne* on the XXXIX. Articles. *Strype's* Annals. *E. Cardwell*, Hist. of Conferences on Book of Prayer (1558–1690), 3d ed., 1849; ibid., Documentary Annals of Church of England, 1546–1716, 2 vols., 1843; Formularies of Faith, put forth in the Reign of Henry VIII., and Three Primers, put forth in the same reign; Collection of Articles, etc. *Dean Nowell's* Catechism, 1572, new ed. by *W. Jacobson*. *Sparrow's* Hist. of Articles, Injunction, etc., 4to., 1684, 1846; *ibid.*, Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer, 1724. *F. Bulley*, Tabular View of Variations in the Communion and Baptismal Offices of the Church of England, 1540 to 1662, Oxf., 1842. The Book of Common Prayer is to be taken with the XXXIX. Articles, in estimating the doctrinal position of the Church of England. Besides the above works, see *Wheatley*, Rational Illustration of Book of Common Prayer, 1720, 1846; *Shepherd*, 2 vols., 1801; *Thos. Lathbury*, Hist. of Book of Common Prayer, 2d ed., 1859; *Procter*, 1857.—The Homilies of the Church of England, 1st Book, 1547; 2d Book, 1563; edited by Prof. *Corrie*, Camb., 1850.—*Gibson*, Codex Juris. Ecclesiastici Anglicani, 2 fol., 1761.—First Prayer Book, 1549; revised 1552; XLII. Articles, 1552–3, by Cranmer, not adopted by Convocation—several of the articles from Augsb. Confession; XXXIX. Articles, 1552, by Alp. Parker, making use of Wurtemberg Confession; altered to XXXVIII. in 1563; in 1571 restored to XXXIX. and made binding. The XXXIX. Articles were ratified by the Protest. Episcopal Church in the United States; the Book of Common Prayer, revised under direction of the First General Convocation, Phila., 1786 (omitting Nicene and Athanasian creeds, absolution, baptismal regeneration, etc.), but nearly all restored (excepting the Athanasian creed and absolution in visitation of the sick), in consequence of the objections of the English bishops.]

[7] It was published, A. D. 1560, and consisted of 25 articles. Its principal author was the Scotch Reformer *John Knox* (his views on the doctrine of predestination were less Calvinistic than those on the Lord's Supper). Corpus et Syntagma i. (137) p. 109, ss. *Augusti*, p. 143, ss. Another confession from the year 1581 is appended. Different is the Westminster Confession of Faith, 1643. (Cantabr., 1659, 8; Edinb., 1671, 12). Comp. *Gemberg*, schottische National Kirche, p. 11. *Winer*, l. c. See note below. [*Niemeyer*, 340–359, gives the two Scotch Confessions.]

[8] It was drawn up at a Synod of the Hungarian Reformed churches, A. D. 1557 or 1558, and consisted of 11 articles. *Schröckh*, Kirchengeschichte nach der Reformation, ii. p. 737. Corp. et Synt. i. (186,) p. 148, ss., after the Debreczin edition, 1570. *Winer*, p. 20. *Augusti*, p. 241, ss.

[9] It was originally a private confession of *Guido de Bres*, and was first published A. D. 1562, in the Walloon language (it consisted of 37 articles). It was soon after translated into Dutch, approved by the Dutch churches, and even signed by several princes. It was solemnly confirmed by the Synod of Dort. It was edited by *Festus Hommius*, Lugd. Bat, 1618, 4, and several times subsequently. See *Augusti*, p. 170, ss. [See *Brandt's* History of Ref., Lond., 1720, vol. i., p. 143, *sq.* *Niemeyer*, loc. cit. p. 360–

389; also Præfatio, p. lii–lvii. *Venema*, Inst. Hist. Eccl. vii. p. 252, *sq.* It was at first a private document of de Bres; revised by Saravia, Modetus, and Wingen; published 1563; abbreviated by the synod of Antwerp, 1566. The longer form was adopted by the synod of Wesel, 1568, and of Emden, 1571. The Middleburg synod, 1581, ordered the shorter form to be abridged and translated into Belgic. The edition of Hommius, 1618, was published for the use of the synod of Dort; but the formula as adopted at Dort differs considerably from that given by Hommius. *Niemeyer*, reprints the edition of Hommius. English version in the Appendix to Constitution of Dutch Reformed Church, pp. 40–60.]

[10] Its original title was: Des hochgebornen Fürsten Johann Siegmund, etc., Bekänndniss von jetzigen unter den Evangelischen schwebenden und in Streit gezogenen Punkten, etc. (*i. e.* the Confession of the illustrious Prince John Sigismund, etc., concerning those points respecting which Protestants are now at issue). It consisted of 16 articles. It is not to be confounded with the confession of faith adopted by the Reformed evangelical churches of Germany, which was published at Frankfort on the Oder, 1614, by order of the same prince. For further particulars, see *Winer*, p. 21. It is reprinted by *Augusti*, p. 369, ss.

[11] It was composed by *Calvin*, and appeared 1541, in a French edition, and 1545, in a Latin one. It consists of 4 principal parts (Faith, Law, Prayer, and Sacraments). *Calvini* Opera T. viii. p. 11, ss. *Winer*, p. 22. *Augusti*, p. 460. [Calvin drew up a Catechism in 1536, published in Latin, 1538. See *Henry's* Life of Calvin, ii. 150. In 1541, he revised it, and it was probably published first in French, and then in Latin. See *Niemeyer*, xxxvii.–xli. 123–190.]

[12] Adopted by a General Synod in Poland, convened for pacification, under Vladislas IV., in Thorn, 1645, it came to be very generally received in a large part of the Reformed Church of Eastern Europe. [See also the Consensus Poloniæ in Niemeyer, 560–591.]

[13] See the special history of doctrines (the chapters on predestination).

[14] It lasted from A. D. 1618, Nov. 13th, to A. D. 1619, May 9th, and held 145 sessions. Its decrees, etc., were published in the Acta Synodi Nationalis, etc. Dort, 1620, 4. [In *Niemeyer*, pp. 690–728. In English, in Appendix to Constitution of the Reformed Dutch Church, 60–75. Acts of the Synod of Dort, Lond., 1620, fol. See too, *Vinke*, Libri Symbolici Eccles. Reform. Nederlandicæ, Traj. ad Rhenum, 1846, which also contains the First Confess. addressed to Philip II., the Confession Ancienne of 1566, etc. The Articles of the Synod of Dort, and its Rejection of Errors, transl. by *Thomas Scott*, 12mo., Utica, 1831. Comp. *Schweizer*, Protest. Central Dogmen, ii. 31–201. *Hales* (John) Golden Remains; and, Hist. Concil. Dordrech. ed. Moshemius, Hamb., 1728. *Graf*, Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Synode von Dordrecht, Basel, 1825.]

[15] It was directed, in the first instance, against the theory of the universality of grace, advocated in the academy of Saumur (comp. § 225, note 3), and was instigated chiefly by *Heinrich Heidegger*, of Zurich, *Francis Turretin*, of Geneva, and *Lucas Gernler*, of Basle. The draft was drawn up by *Heidegger* under the title: Formula Consensus Ecclesiarum Helveticarum

Reformatarum circa doctrinam de gratia universali, et connexa, aliaque nonnulla capita. It consists of 26 articles. As to its history, and the controversies to which it gave rise, as well as concerning its final abolition (by the intervention of Prussia and England, A. D. 1723,) see *Pfaff*, C. M., Schediasma de Form. Consens. Helvet. Tub. 1723, 4.—*Hottinger*, J. J., Succincta ac Genuina Formulæ Consensus Helv. Historia (in the Bibl. Brem. vii. p. 669, ss. It was separately published, Zur. 1723). Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des troubles arrivées en Suisse à l'occasion du Consensus. Amst. 1726 (by *Barnaud*, pastor at La Tour, near Vevay). *Leonh. Meister*, helvet. Scenen der neuern Schwärmeri und Intoleranz. Zurich, 1785, p. 3, ss. *Escher*, in the Allgemeine Encyclopædie, l. c. p. 243, ss. *Alex. Schweizer*, Die theologisch-ethischen Zustände (§ 223, note 21), s. 35, *sq.* [*Gass*, Gesch. d. Protest. Dogmatik, ii. (1857), s. 328–374. Syntagma Thesium Theologicarum in Acad. Salmur., ed. 2, Salm., 1664. *Aymon.*, Tous les Synodes Nationales des Eglises Reform. ii. 604, *sq.* *Dallæus*, Apologia pro duabus Synodis, Amst., 1685. *Rivet* Opera, iii. Tom: Synopsis Doctrinæ de Natura et Gratia (Tom. iii. p. 830, *sq*) *Schweizer*, Protest. Centraldogmen, ii., Die Amyraldischen Streitigkeiten, s. 225–439; der Helvetische Consensusformel, s. 439–564, and s. 663–748; and in Theol. Jahrb. (Tübing.), 1852, i. 41, ii. 155.]

Among the symbols of the Reformed Church are further enumerated: the Confessiones Polonicæ, (1. Consensus Sendomiriensis, 1570. 2. Thoruniensis Synodi generalis, A. D. 1595, d. 21, Aug. celebratæ canones). Confessio Bohemica, 1535 (1558, 4.) Colloquium Lipsiacum, 1631. Declaratio Thoruniensis, 1645. (They are all reprinted in the works of *Augusti* [and *Niemeyer*], who also give all desirable historical information.)—On the symbols of the Puritans see, *Niemeyer, G. A.*, Collectionis Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis publicatarum. Appendix., Lips., 1840. Conf. Westmonasteriensis (1659, 60, 64), and the two Catechisms (1647). Hallische Literatur Zeitung, Jan., 1841.

[The *Westminster Assembly*, convened by order of Parliament, 1643, consisting of 151 members. The Confession was presented to the Commons, Dec. 11, 1646: Shorter Catechism, Nov. 5, 1647: Larger Catechism, April 5, 1648. The General Assembly of Scotland ratified the Confession, Aug. 27, 1647, and the Catechism, July, 1648. The Synod of Cambridge, New England, adopted the Confession in 1648. The *Savoy Confession*, drawn up by the Indepeudents, 1658, is, in its doctrinal parts, nearly identical with the Westminster; a Boston Synod, 1680, adopted this Confession; in 1708 it was adopted at Saybrook, for the Connecticut churches. The West. Confess was adopted by the Presb. church in America, 1729 (Adopting Act); it is also received by the various branches of Presbyterians in Scotland, Ireland, and the United States. The Baptists of England adopted a Confession of Faith, Lond., 1643. Conf. of the Seven Churches, published, 1646, in 52 articles; and the Confession of the Assembly in 1688 (London), in 35 chapters (called in the United States the Philadelphia Confession). Comp. *S. S. Cutting*, Histl. Vindication, Bost., 1859. Some English Baptists in Amsterdam, published a Confession in 1611; another London Confession, 1640; Somerset's Confession, 1656. See *Ed. Dean Underhill*, Conf. of Faith of Baptists, for Harsard Knollys Society, Lond., 1854.]

§ 223.

THE SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

On the literature, compare § 216. *Al. Schweizer*, Reformirte Glaubenslehre (Introduction) and his Protestant. Centraldogmen, Zürich, 1854–6. *Ebrard*, Dogmatik i. 62, *sq.*, [transl. in Mercersburg Qu. Rev., 1857. *Gass*, ubi supra. *Heppe*, Dogmatik des Deutschen Protest. Bd. i. s. 139–204, Entstehung und Ausbildung der deutsch-reformirt. Dogmatik. *Twesten*, Dogmatik. i. (1834), s. 226–273. *Hagenbach's* Leben und ausgewählte Schriften der Väter und Begründer der reformirt. Kirche, IX. Bände.]

Systematic theology was on the whole less cultivated in the Reformed Church than exegesis, though it was not kept in the background. In addition to the labors of Zwingle and Calvin (§ 219), many of their followers,* such as *Heinr. Bullinger*,[1] *Andr. Gerh. Hyperius*,[2] *Wolfgang Musculus* [*Dusanus*],[3] *Ben. Aretius*,[4] *Wilh. Bucanus*,[5] *Theodore Beza*,[6] *Petrus Ramus*,[7] *Daniel Chamier*,[8] and others, wrote compendiums of dogmatic theology. The scholastic method, too, soon found its way into the Reformed Church, as the representatives of which we may mention *Bartholomew Keckermann*,[9] *Amandus Polanus a Polansdorf*,[10] *J. H. Alsted*,[11] *John Sharp*,[12] *John Wollebius*,[13] *Henry Alting*,[14] *John Maccovius*,[15] *Gisbert Voëtius*,[16] *Mark Frederick Wendelin*,[17] *John Hornbeck*,[18] *Samuel Marcsius*,[19] *Andrew Rivetus*,[20] and, preëminently, *John Henry Heidegger*.[21] A peculiar theological system, in the so-called federal method, was inaugurated by *J. Coccejus*,[22] and more fully developed by his followers, the most eminent of whom were *Francis Burrmann*,[23] *Abraham Heidanus*,[24] *Hermann Witsius*.[25] *Melchior Leydecker*, on the other hand, treated the whole system of theology in the order of the three persons of the Trinity.[26] Others, again, adopted other methods.[27]

[1] Bullinger was born A. D. 1504, and died 1575. See *Hess*, Lebensgeschichte Heinrich Bullingers, 2 vol., 1828, 29.—He wrote: Compend. Rel. Christ. e puro Dei Verbo depromtum, Basil., 1556. Concerning the part which he took in the composition of various confessions of faith, see the preceding §. [On Bullinger, see *Schenkel* in Herzog's Realencyclop. and

* [*Peter Martyr Vermilius, Bucer, Capito, Oecolampadius, Pictet*, and *Myconius* also deserve mention as helping to give shape to the Reformed system. *Peter Martyr*, an Italian, taught in Strasburg, Oxford, and Zürich, died 1562. His theological system was first published in England, by *Massonius:* then more fully under the title Loci Communes (ed. Gualter), Zürich, 1580, 1626, Heidelb., 1622. Comp. *C. Schmidt*, in *Hagenbach's* Leben der Väter der Ref. K. *McCrie's* Reform. in Italy. *Bucer* (Butzer, Mart.) b., 1491, taught in Strasburg, in England, 1549, died, 1551. No complete edition of his works; one projected in 10 vols. See *Schenkel*, in *Herzog's* Encycl. *Baum*, in *Hagenbach's* Leben d. Väter.—*Capito* (Köpfel), b., 1478, also in Strasburg, died 1541. See *Hagenbach* in *Herzog's* Encycl., and *Baum* in the Leben der Väter.—Of *Oecolampadius* and *Myconius*, Hagenbach has written the lives in his Leben d. Väter d. reform. Kirche.]

Schweizer, loc. cit. His Judgment in certeyne matters on Religion, transl., 1566; 50 Sermons in vol. 5 of Parker Soc. Publications; A hvndred Sermons, 1561; his Decades, by Parker Soc, 4 vols., 1849–52; for a list of his other works transl., see Lowndes' Bibliog. Manual, Bohn's ed., 1858, i. pp. 309, 10. B's Leben und Schriften, by *C. Pestalozzi*, in Hagenbach's Leben und Schriften der Väter, etc.]

[2] *Hyperius* was born, A. D. 1511, at Ypres, and died 1564, as professor of theology in the university of Marburg. His theological works are: Methodi Theologiæ sive præcipuorum Christ. Rel. Locorum Communium Lib. iii. Basil., 1568, 8. Varia Opuscula Theol. ibid., 1570, 71. Comp. *Semler's* Einleitung zu Baumgarten's Glaubenslehre, p. 46, ss. *Heinrich*, p. 293, ss. [On *Hyperius*, compare *Manggold* in Deutsche Zeitschrift, 1855, and in Herzog's Realencyclop. *Heppe*, Dogmatik der deutschen Protest. i. 145, *sq* *Gass*, i. 131.]

[3] His proper name was Müslin, or Mösel. He was born A. D. 1497, in Lothringia, and died 1563, as professor of theology in the university of Berne. He is the author of: Loci Communes Theol., Berne., 1573, 8. Opp. Bas. ix. fol. *Semler*, l. c. p. 56, note 28. *Gass*, 131.

[4] *Aretius* died A. D. 1574, as professor of theology in the university of Berne; was previously professor in Marburg. He wrote: Theologica Problemata sive Loci Communes, Bern., 1604. *Semler*, l. c. p. 54, note 26. *Heinrich*, 296. *Gass*, 131.

[5] *Bucanus* was professor of theology in the university of Lausanne, towards the commencement of the seventeenth century, and wrote: Institutt. Theol., etc., Brem., 1604. Genev., 1612.

[6] *Beza* was born A. D. 1519, at Vécelay, and died 1605. (Compare his biography by *Schlosser*, Heidelb., 1809.) Quæstionum et Responsionum Christ. Libellus in his Tractt. Theol. vol. i. p. 654. *Baum's* Beza, 2 Bde., 1843–52, and Beilagen. [*Beza's* Brief Declaration of the Table of Predestination, transl., London (no date); Sermons, 1687; other works translated, see in *Lowndes*, ubi supra, p. 169. Herzog in his Encyclopedia. *Heppe's* Life of Beza is to form vol. vi. of Hagenbach's Leben der Väter der reform. Kirche.]

[7] Peter Ramus (*de la Ramée*) was born at Cuth, in Picardy, and died a martyr, St. Bartholomew's night, Aug. 25, 1572. He wrote: Commentariorum de Religione Christ. lib. iv., Francof., 1576. De Fide, de Lege, de Precatione, de Sacramentis.) [*Chs. Waddington*, Ramus, sa Vie, ses Ecrits, Paris, 1855. *Ritter*, Gesch. der Christl., Phil. v. 471. *Tennemann*, ix. 420. Eclectic (Lond.), Sept. 1856. *Hallam's* Lit. Europe, i. 205.]

[8] *Chamier* was born in Dauphiny; died Oct. 16, 1621, professor at Montauban, during the siege of that city. He wrote: Panstratia Catholica, s. Corpus Controversiarum adversus Pontificios, Genev., 1606, v. vol. fol. Corpus Theologicum, s. Loci Communes Theologici, ib., 1653, fol. (opus posthumum.) [Memoir of *Chamier*, with Notices of his Descendants, Lond., 1852. *Haag*, in La France Protestante, iii. 316. *C. Schmidt*, in Herzog's Encyclop.]*

* Other Reformed divines of the 16th century are *Francis Junius*, died 1602, professor

[9] *Keckermann*, born at Dantzic, was professor in the university of Heidelberg, and died 1609, Aug. 25th (Adami Vitæ Philos. p. 232, ss. *Bayle*, Dict.: "*his works abound in plagiarisms, and have themselves been plagiarised by many others.*") He wrote: Systema Theol. tribus libris adornat. Hanoviæ, 1607. Opp. Genev., 1614, 4. *Gass*, 408.

[10] *Polanus* was born at Troppau, in Silesia, A. D. 1561, delivered lectures in the university of Basle, and died 1610 (comp. Athenæ Raur. p. 37.) He composed a Syntagma Theol. Christ. Han., 1610. See *Gass*, i. 396. [*Gass* says Polanus gave the first example of an elaboration of the doctrinal system, expounding and making distinctions, in the causal method.]

[11] *Alsted* was born A. D. 1588, at Herborn, and died at Weissenbourg, A. D. 1638, where he was professor of theology. His works are very numerous: Theologia Naturalis Francof., 1615, 22, 4.—Theologia Catechetica, ib., 1622, 4, Han., 1722, 4.—Theologia Scholastica, ib., 1618, 4.—Theol. Didactica, 1627, 4.—Theologia Polemica, ibid., eod.—Theologia Prophetica. ib., 1622, 4.—Theol. Casuum., Hanov., 1630, 4. *Gass*, 411.

[12] *Sharp* (J. Scoto-Brittanus), was professor at Die on the Drome, in Dauphiny. He wrote: Cursus Theologicus, in quo Controversiæ omnes de Fidei Dogmatibus inter nos et Pontificios pertractantur, et ad Bellarmini Argumenta respondetur, ed. 2, Genev., 1620. See *Schweizer*, s. xxi. [He also wrote Symphonia Prophetarum et Apostolorum, Genev., 1670.]

[13] *John Wollebs* was born 1586, died 1629, professor of theology at Basle. He wrote: Compendium Christ. Theolog., Basle, 1626; also translated into English, Christian Divinity [Abridgment of Christ. Divinitie, by *Rose*, with the Anatomy of the whole Body of Divinitie, 12mo., 1650.] He is distinguished for simplicity. *Ebrard* (Dogmatik), calls him "*one of the greatest theologians that ever lived.*" Comp. *Gass*, i. 397 [and *Schweizer*, ii. 26, who contest this judgment.]

[14] *John H. Alting*, born at Emden, was professor at Heidelberg from 1613, died 1644, professor in Gröningen. Works: Problemata tum theoretica, tum practica, Amst., 1662, 4to.—Theologia Elenchtica, Bas., 1670, Amst., 1664.—Method. Theol. Didact., Amst., 1650. Tiguri, 1673. His son, *Jacob Alting*, was also distinguished in theology and polemics; Methodus Theol. in his Opera, Amst., 1687. See *Gass*, i. 434. [*H. Alting* also wrote: Theologia Historica, Amst., 1664. Exegesis Augustan. Confess., 1652. See *Schweizer*, in *Herzog's* Realencyclop.]

[15] His proper name was Makowsky; he was born at Lobzenik, in Poland, A. D. 1508, professor of theology in Franecker, and died A. D. 1644. He adopted the Aristotelian method of investigation, and composed: Loci Commun. Theol. Fran., 1639, 8, ed. auct. Nic. Arnold, 1650, 4. An improved edition of this work appeared 1685. In addition he wrote: Quæstiones Theolog. Frankcof, 1626, 8. Distinctiones et Regulæ Theolog. Amst., 1656, 12. *Heinrich*, p. 355. *Gass*, 441.

[16] *Voetius* was born A. D. 1589, at Heusden, in Holland, held a professorship of theology in the universi y of Utrecht, and died 1676. (He opposed

at Leyden; *Anton Sardel* (Chardieu); *Hieronymus Zanchius*, died 1590; *Boquin*, died 1532. See *Gass*, 139. *Heppe*, 148.

Cartesius.) Works: Theol. Naturalis Reformata., Lond., 1656, 4. Institutiones Theol. Traj., 1642, 4.—Disputationes Selectæ, ibid. 1684, Amst., 1669, 5 vols. 4.—See *Buddæus*, i. p. 417 (375.) *Heinrich*, pp. 355, 356. *Gass*, i. 460. [*Schweizer*, ii. 802.]

[17] *Wendelin* was born A. D. 1584, at Sandhagen, near Heidelberg, and died 1652, at Zerbst, where he was Rector Gymnasii. He wrote: Christ. Theol. Libri. ii. methodice dispositi, Han., 1634, 41, Amst., 46, Christ. Theol. Systema Majus., Cassel., 1656, 4. *Buddæus*, p. 416. *Heinrich*, p. 356. *Gass*, 416. [*Schweizer*, ii. 522.]

[18] *Hornbeck*, was born A. D. 1617, at Haarlem, and died 1666, as a professor in the university of Leyden. He composed: Institutt. Theol. Ultraj., 1653, Lugd. Bat. 58, 8. See *Buddæus*, p. 417. *Heinrich*, p. 357. [*Gass*, ii. 287, 293. *Schweizer*, i. 379. He also wrote Socinianismi Confutatio, 3 Tom., Amst., 1664.]

[19] His proper name was des Marets; he was born A. D. 1598, at Oisemont, in the province of Picardy, and died 1673, at Groningen. Works: Collegium Theologicum sive Systema Universale. Gron., 1658, 4.—Theologiæ Elenchticæ nova Synopsis sive Index Controversiarum, etc., ibid., 1648, ii. 4, and several others. *Gass*, ii. 442. [He also wrote against Cocceius and Descartes: see *Schweizer*, ii., passim.]

[20] *Rivetus* was born A. D. 1573, and died 1651. Most of his works were exegetical. The following is of a Polemico-dogmatic character: Catholicus Orthodoxus sive Summa Controversiarum inter Orthodoxos et Pontificios, Lugd. Bat., 1630, ii. 4. He also composed several controversial writings, and other treatises. Opp. Rotterd., 1651, 60, iii. fol. [*Rivetus* was especially active against Amyraut and the school of Saumur. His writings against A. are in the 3d vol. of his Opera, pp. 828–878. Comp. *Schweizer*, ubi supra, s. 342–354. *Gass*, ii. 339–349. His collection of testimonies as to the doctrine of original sin in Theol. Essays, from the Princeton Rev. (Vol. I., 1846), pp. 196, *sq.*].

[21] *Heidegger* was born in 1633; died, professor of theology, in Zurich, in 1698. He was the author of the Formula Consensus [see *Schweizer*, ii. 482, *sq.*] He also wrote: Medulla Theologiæ Christian. Tur., 1696, 1702, 1713; Corpus Theol. Christ. s. Theol. didacticæ, moralis et historicæ Systema, 2 fol. Tur., 1700, 1732. Medulla Medullæ, 1701. Also, many dissertations. See *Alex. Schweizer*, Die theologisch-ethischen Zustände der 2. Hälfte des 17, Jahrh. in d. Zürich. Kirche Zür., 1857, s. 12, *sq.* [*Gass*, ii. 353, *sq.* Herzog's Encycl. article Helvetic Confessions, by *Trechsel*.]

[22] *Cocceius'* original name was Koch. He was born at Bremen, 1603, and died 1669. His doctrinal system was founded upon the idea of a covenant between God and man. He distinguished between (1.) the covenant before the fall (the covenant of works), and (2.) the covenant after the fall (the covenant of grace.) The latter covenant embraces a threefold economy: 1. The economy prior to the law. 2. The economy under the law. 3. The economy of the Gospel. His principles are developed in his Summa Doctrinæ de Fœdere et Testamentis Dei, 1648. See *Buddæus*, p. 417. *Heinrich*, p. 358, ss. *Heppe*, s. 204, *sq.*: "*The fruit of his influence on the Reformed systematic theology was to lead theologians back to the freedom of*

the Word of God, delivering it from the bondage of a traditional scholasticism, and of a mode of handling the topics which subserved the interests of the culture of the schools." [Compare particularly *Ebrard*, Dogmatick, i. 74–78, and in *Herzog's* Encyclop. *Schweizer*, ii. 665, 802.

[23] *Burmann*, was born at Leyden, 1628, professor of theology at Utrecht from 1662, died 1679. He wrote: Synopsis Theologiæ et Oeconomiæ Fœderum Dei, Amst., 1671, 1691, 2 Tom. [*Gass*, ii. 310.]

[24] *Heidanus*, born at Frankenthal, in the Palatinate, 1648, professor of theology at Leyden, deposed on account of the controversies about the Cartesian Philosophy, died 1678; wrote Corpus Theol. Christ., 2 Tom., 1687. [*Gass*, ii. 300–307. *Schweizer*, ii. 677.]

[25] *Witsius* was born in West Friesland, 1626, professor of theology at Franecker, Utrecht and Leyden; died, 1708. Works: Miscellanea Sacra, 2 Tom., Amst., 1692. Oeconomia Fœderum, Traj., 1694. Meletemat, Leidensia, Lugd., 1703. *Collected* works, vi. Tom., Herborn, 1712–1717. Basle, 1739, 4to. [Economy of the Covenants, transl. by Crookshank, 2 vols., Edinb., 1803. Ibid., a new transl., 3 vols., New York, 1798. Account of his life, from the Latin Oration of Marckius, in *Toplady's* Works, vol. iv. *Schweizer*, ii. 804. *Gass*, ii. 316. *Ebrard*, i. 79.]—On other disciples of Cocceius, *Wilh. Momma*, [died, 1677; wrote De Varia Conditione et Statu Ecclesiæ Dei sub triplici Oeconomia Fœderum Dei, etc. Utrecht, 1671.] *Joh. Braun* [died, 1709: Doctrina Fœderum, sive Syst. Theol. Amst., 1688; *Van der Waeijen*, professor in Franecker, Summa Theol., 1689], and *Nic. Gürtler*, see *Walch*, 222, *sq.* *Heinrich*, 362. [*Gass* and *Ebrard*.]

[26] *Leydecker* was born A. D. 1642, at Middleburg, in the Dutch province of Zeeland, and died 1721, as professor of theology in the university of Utrecht. (His views were opposed to those of Cocceius.) He wrote: De Œconomia trium Personarum in Negotio Salutis Humanæ libri vi. Traj., 1682, 12.

[27] *E. g.*, *Heinr. Hulsius*, *Le Blanc*, *Markius*, and *Turretin*. Comp. *Walch*, p. 225, ss. *Heinrich*, p. 373, ss.

[*Stephen Szegeden* (Seegedin) a Hungarian, published in Basle, 1585, Theologiæ sinceræ Loci Communes, rep. 1593; see *Ebrard*, Dogmatik, i. 65. His friend *Grynæus*, the teacher of Arminius, in his Opusc. Theol., opposed the doctrine of predestination.—*William Ames*, b. 1576, studied theology at Cambridge, chaplain at the Hague, where he opposed Arminius. Professor at Franeker, 1622, died 1633. He wrote: De Arminii Sentent., 1616: Medulla Theologiæ, 1628; De Conscientia et ejus Jure; strictly Puritanic; collected works, 5 vols., Amst., 1628. See *Schweizer*, in Herzog—*Antoine la Faye*, professor in Geneva, died 1616; Enchiridion Theologicum Doctorum et Professorum in Acad. Leydens. 1605. *Joh. Polyandri*, *Andr. Riveti*, *Ant. Walaei* et *Anton. Thysii* Synopsis purioris Theologiæ, Lugd. Batav., 1652.—*Joh. Heinr. Hottinger*, Cursus Theolog. in Methodo Altingiana, Heidelb., 1660.]

§ 223. *a.*

[THE GERMAN REFORMED THEOLOGY.]

[The *German Reformed Theology*[1] assumed a peculiar type, intermediate between the Swiss Calvinism, and the German Lutheranism; between the strict predestination of the one, and the sacramental theories of the other. It perpetuated the spirit of Melancthon, and fostered union with the Calvinists. It took its origin in the Palatinate, and received its expression in the Heidelberg Catechism,[2] drawn up by *Olevianus*,[3] and *Ursinus*;[4] though its general spirit is manifest in the works of *Andreas Hyperius*,[5] professor in Marburg. Among its other representatives are *Peter Boquin*,[6] *Hemming*,[7] *Christopher Pezel*,[8] *George Sohnius*.[9] In the writings of the latter, of *Hieron. Zanchius*,[10] of *Raph. Eglin*,[11] of *Matthias Martinius*,[12] of *Bartholomew Keckermann*,[13] of *Marcus Fried. Wendelin*,[14] of *Ludwig Crocius*,[15] and *John Piscator*,[16] it became more scholastic in its character, and was merged in the stricter Calvinistic tendency. It was also fostered in the theological gymnasium of Bremen[17] as well as at Heidelberg; and from this school proceeded *John Coccceius*, who gave a new shape to the theology of Holland, by insisting on the Covenants as the central idea.]

[1] [See *Ebrard*, Dogmatik i., § 35; and especially *Heppe*, in his Gesch. des deutschen Protest., and his Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus, i. 139–204. Dr. Heppe makes the peculiarities of this theology to consist in three points: 1. Making the central idea to be that of the covenant (fœdus Dei), particularly as seen in the kingdom of Christ: 2. The idea of an essential union with Christ (insitio in Christum): 3. Deduced from these two, the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. Comp. Heppe on German Ref. Church, transl. in the Mercersb. Rev., from Stud. u. Kritiken, 1853.]

[2] [On the *Heidelberg Catechism*, see § 222, note 3, and the work of *Nevin*, Hist. and Genius of Heidelberg Catechism, 1847. Princeton Review, 1852. Nevin, in Mercersb. Rev., in reply, 1852.]

[3] [*Caspar Olevianus* was born at Treves, 1536, studied law at Paris, and then theology at Geneva, preached and taught at Heidelberg, 1560–1576; died in Herborn, 1587. He wrote: Expositio Symboli Apostol., 1576; De Substantia Fœderis gratuiti inter Deum et electos, Genev., 1585 (his chief work). Comp. *Sudhoff*, in Leben de Väter d. Ref. K; *Heppe*, ubi supra, i. 149–158; *J. Marx*, Caspar Olevian. oder der Calvinismus in Trier. Mainz., 1846.]

[4] [*Zachary Ursinus* (Beer) was born in Breslau, 1584, studied under Melancthon, in Wittenberg, taught in Heidelberg, 1561–78, died in Neustadt on the Hardt, 1583. Loci Theologici, 1562. His lectures on the Heidelb. Catechism were published in an imperfect form at Geneva (Doctrinæ Christ. Compendium), 1584: edited by his successor at Heidelberg, David Pareus

(†1622), in 1591, under the title Explicationum Catechet. Partes IV.; still more improved 1598, under the title, Corpus Doctrinæ Christ. Opera, 3 fol. Heidelb., 1613. See *Heppe*, u. s. i. 158–160. An English version by *Henrie Parrie*, Summe of Christ. Religion, 1587, 1589 (abridged), 1617, 1645 ("conferred with the last Latine of Pareus," and including his theological Medulla). An American edition by *G. W. Willard*, Columbus, Ohio, 1851. Comp. *Sudhoff*, in Leben d. Väter der Ref. Kirche, Bd. viii.]

[5] *Hyperius*, see § 223, note 2.

[6] [*Boquin* was professor at Heidelb., died 1582. He wrote: Exegesis divinæ atque humanæ κοινωνίας, Heidelb., 1561. See Heppe, i. 148.]

[7] [*Nicolas Hemming*, of Denmark, professor in Copenhagen. He wrote: Enchiridion Theolog., 1557; Syntagma Institutionum Christ. 1574, also reprinted in Geneva. See *Heppe*, i. 85, 161.]

[8] [*Pezel*, born 1539, exiled from Wittenberg for his Philippism, 1574, died at Bremen, 1604. See *Heppe*, i. 161. His chief aim was to introduce Melancthon to the Reformed church, for which he collected, 1580–89, in 8 vols., the Argumenta et Objectiones of Melancthon on the articles of the faith; edited the Loci Theologici of *Victorin Strigel* (Melancthon's friend, born 1524, professor at Jena, 1548, and after 1562 in Heidelberg, where he died, 1569. *Heppe*, u. s.); and in 1587, the Examen Theologicum Phil. Mel.]

[9] [*Sohnius*, born 1551, professor in Marburg and Heidelberg, died 1589. Synopsis Corporis Doctr. Phil. Mel. Heidelb., 1588. His works collected, 4 vols., 1591, 3d ed., 1609. See *Heppe*, i. 175.]

[10] [*Zanchius*, born in Italy, 1516, professor at Strasburg, Heidelberg; died 1591. See *Heppe*, i. 178. De Relig. Christ. Fide, 1585.]

[11] [*Raph. Eglin*, Diexodus Theologica de magno illo Insitionis nostræ in Christum Mysterio, and, De Fœdere Gratiæ, Marpurgi, 1613. See *Heppe*, Dogmatik der Ev. Ref. Kirche, 1861.]

[12] [*Martini*, professor at Herborn and Bremen; died 1630. He wrote: Christ. Doctr. Summa Capita, 1603. Summula Theol. Brem., 1610. See *Heppe*, i. 185, *sq.*]

[13] [See § 223, note 9. Heppe says of him (i. 187), that the height of the religious and philosophical speculation, and of the dialectic skill, of the German Ref. dogmatics is found in his system.]

[14] See § 223, note 17.

[15] [*Crocius* was a deputy from Bremen to the synod of Dort: died 1655. He wrote: De Perseverantia Sanctorum, Brem., 1616; Syntagma Sacræ Theologiæ, 1636. See *Heppe*, i. 199, *sq.* *Tholuck*, Vorgesch. des Rationalismus, i. 297.]

[16] [*John Piscator* (Fisher), born at Strasburg, Mar. 27, 1546, professor at Strasburg, Heidelb., 1574–77, Herborn, 1584–1625, where he was the chief ornament of the Academy. His translation of the Bible, 1602–3, 3d ed., 1624. In philosophy he followed Ramus. Aphorism. Doctr. Christ., 1594, and numerous doctrinal (as well as exegetical) treatises. On his doctrine that the active obedience of Christ is not imputed, see the special History. Comp. *Staubing*, in Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol. 1841. *Schröckh*, Kir

chengesch. seit Ref. v. 358. *Tholuck*, Akad. Leben, 2, 304. *Herzog*, in his Encyclop.]

[17] [On the school of Bremen, see *Heppe*, i. 195.]

§ 224.

MYSTICISM IN THE REFORMED CHURCH.

M. Goebel, Geschichte des christl. Lebens in der Rheinisch-westphälischen evang. Kirche, ii. Coblenz, 1852. *Hamberger*, Stimmen aus dem Heiligthum, Stuttg., 1857. *Noack*, Mystik. Comp. § 217. [*M. Goebel*, Gesch. d. Inspirations-Gemeinden, 1688, *sq.*, in Niedner's Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol., 1853–4.]

The mysticism of the Roman Catholic Church was introduced into the Reformed Church, first by *John Labadie* and his followers,[1] and afterwards by *Peter Poiret*,[2] a disciple of *Antoinette Bourignon*.[3] In England, *Joanna* (Jane) *Leade*,[4] was followed by *John Pordage*,[5] *Thomas Bromley*, and others. But this kind of mysticism, which was partly fantastic, partly indifferent to all systematic forms, has exerted little or no influence upon the development of theology.[6]

[1] *Labadie* was born A. D. 1610, at Bourg, in the province of Guienne, joined the Reformed Church without accepting its fundamental principles, and died 1674, at Altona. In many points he agreed with the Anabaptists. Among his admirers were *Anna Maria von Schürmann*, *Peter Yvon*, *Peter du Lignon*, *Henry and Peter Schluter*. Comp. *Arnold*, Kirchen- und Ketzergeschichte, vol. ii. p. 680. *Hagenbach*, Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Reformation, iv. p. 307. [*Weismann*, Hist. Eccles. p. 927. *Mosheim*, iii. 479.] *Göbel*, ubi supra, ii. 181: and on Anna Schürmann, ibid., 273. The judgment of the Reformed orthodoxy about these phenomena were often very severe; comp. *J. C. Schweizer*, as quoted by *Al. Schweizer*, ubi supra, s. 19. [*Hase*, Church Hist., New York ed., p. 508. *Barthold* in *Raumer's* Hist. Taschenbuch, 1852–3.]

[2] *Poiret* was born A. D. 1646, at Mentz, and died 1719, at Rheinsberg. His writings are of greater importance for the history of doctrines than those of the other mystics (though only in a negative aspect). Concerning his life and his works see *Arnold*, l. c. p. 163; Biographie universelle, sub voce; and *Hagenbach*, Vorlesungen iv. p. 325. [He wrote: L'Oeconomie Divine, 7 vol., Amst., 1686, afterwards publ. in Latin. The Divine Oeconomy, 6 vol., London, 1713. Le Chretien réel, ou la Vie du Marquis de Rentz, etc., 2 vol., Col., 1701–2. Cogitationes Ration. de Deo, etc., 2d ed., Amst., 1685.]

[3] *Antoinette Bourignon* was born A. D. 1616, at Lisle, in Flanders, and died 1680, at Franeker. A memoir of her life was published Amst., 1683. See Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, 1837. *Hagenbach*, Vorlesungen, iv. p. 312, ss.—[*Kloze* in *Niedner's* Zeitschrift on Dippel and Bourignon, 1851,

s. 467, *sq.* Apology for M. Antonia Bourignon, Lond., 1699. Of her works the following have been translated: Light of the World, 1696. Solid Virtue, 1699. Light in Darkness, 1706. Gospel Spirit, 1707. Warning against Quakers, 1708. Academy of Learned Divines, 1708. Comp. *Bayle's* Dictionnaire.]—*Amos Comenius*, *Swamerdam*, and others, adopted her opinions.

Jane Leade was born A. D. 1633, and died 1714 [1704 ?]; she was an enthusiast. Comp. *Corrodi*, Geschichte des Chiliasmus iii. p. 403, ss. *Arnold*, Kirchen- und Ketzergesch. p. 199–298, ss. *Hagenbach*, Vorlesungen, iv. p. 345. [List of her works in Notes and Queries, 1856, p. 93. Among them (see *Lowndes'* Bibl. Manual) are The Enochian Walks; Fountain of Gardens, 1678–86, 3 vols.; The Laws of Paradise; Wonders of God's Creation in eight Worlds, 1695. She established the Philadelphia Society in 1697.]

[6] *Corrodi*, l. c. [Pordage died 1688. Works: Divine and True Metaphysics, 3 vols., and Theologia Mystica.]

[6] The mysticism of the Lutheran Church was of greater speculative importance than that of the Reformed. The former also exerted a greater influence upon the life of the German nation (domestic worship, etc.), than the latter, which was more confined to private individuals and schismatics.

§ 225.

INFLUENCE OF THE CARTESIAN PHILOSOPHY. MORE LIBERAL TENDENCIES.

Mysticism exerted less influence upon the gradual transformation of the doctrinal views of the Reformed Church, than did the philosophical system of Descartes, especially in the Netherlands.[1] [The Cartesian theologians, in a special manner attempted to reconcile the principles of natural and revealed theology.[2] The influence of the system is seen in the works of *Abraham Heidanus*,[3] *Peter van Mastricht*,[4] *Solomon van Til*,[5] *Campejus Vitringa*,[6] and *J. Marck*,[7]] *Balthazzar Bekker*, who, in combating the "*Enchanted World*," also shook the orthodox doctrines of the Church, belonged to this school.[8] But, apart from the influence of any definite system of philosophy, a more liberal tendency, which endeavored to shake off the yoke of symbolical writings, manifested itself in different quarters. Such was the case in the university of Saumur,[9] where this tendency was connected with Arminian views, and among the Latitudinarians of England.[10] Among the Swiss theologians *John Alph. Turretin*,[11] *Ben. Pictet*,[12] and *Samuel Werenfels*,[13] were distinguished for moderate views, though they remained orthodox; thus they formed, by their principles, as well as the period in which they lived, the transition to the eighteenth century.

[1] *Renatus Cartesius* (René Descartes), was born A. D. 1596, and died 1650, at Stockholm. His maxim: "Cogito, ergo sum," is well known. His philosophy gave rise to commotions in Holland. *Gisbert Voëtius*, the principal opponent of Cartesius, charged him A. D. 1639, with atheism. The philosophy of Cartesius was condemned A. D. 1647 (and again 1676), by the senate of the university of Leyden, as well as 1657 by the Synod of Delft. Several of the mystics just mentioned belonged originally to the school of Cartesius. But some orthodox divines also espoused the system. See *Tholuck*, Das akademische Leben des 17 Jahrb., 2te. Abtheilung, 1854, and in Herzog's Realencycl. ii. 391. *Gass*, i. 454. [*Ebrard*, Dogmatik, i. 81–86. On *Descartes*, see *Bouillier*, De la Revolution Cartésienne, Paris, 1842, 2d ed., 2 vol., Paris, 1854; *Cousin*, Leçons; *Dugald Stewart's* Dissertations; *Morell's* Hist. of Philos.; *Ritter's* Gesch. d. Phil.; Edinb. Review, 1852; *Simon*, Œuvres de Descartes, Introduction, 1844.—*Francis Burmann*, the son-in-law of Heidanus, adopted the Cartesian system; see § 223, note 29. *Clauburg*, in Duisburg, 1653–65, and *Heinr. Hulsius*, 1684–1729, taught it; the latter went so far as to represent theology as the *ancilla* of philosophy. The Lutheran *Job. Wagner*, Tübing., wrote against it: Examen elenchticum Atheismi speculativi, 1677. Comp. *Tholuck*, in Herzog, u. s. on the Cartesian philosophy.]

[2] [On the influence of Cartesianism, see *Ebrard*, Dogmatik, i. § 42. The opposition between the scholastics and federalists was on the relation of the Bible to the doctrine of the church; the contrast between the scholastic divines and the Cartesians, was on the relation of revelation to reason.]

[3] On *Heidan* see § 223, note 24.

[4] [*Peter van Mastricht*, professor in Utrecht, died 1806. He opposed Cartesianism in his Theologia theoretico-practica, Amst., 1682, and especially in his Novitiatum Cartes. Gangræna, 1675.]

[5] [*Van Til*, professor in Dort and Leyden, died 1713. He showed himself to be one of the ablest of the Reformed divines, in his Theologiæ utriusque Compendium tum Naturalis tum Revelatæ, Leyd., 1704, mediating between the scholastic divines and the Cartesians, and distinguishing between the *articuli puri* and *mixti* of theology—the latter being those which have a basis in the soul, though the clearest light is thrown on them by revelation. See *Ebrard*, i. 84.]

[6] [*Vitringa* was professor in Franeker, died 1722; wrote Doctrina Christ. Rel. per Aphorismos summatim descripta, Franeker, 1690.]

[7] [*Marck*, professor in Leyden, died 1731; comp. Theol. Christ. didactico-elenchticum, Gron. 1686.]

[8] *Bekker* was born A. D. 1634, in West Friesland, adopted the principles of Cartesius, was dismissed from office on account of his opinions, and died 1698. (Compare the chapter on demonology in the special history of doctrines.) His principal work, *Die bezauberte Welt*, Franeker, 1692, 4to., contai s the germs of the rationalism of latter times.

[9] Representatives of the more liberal tendency were, among others, *Moses Amyraldus* (Amyraud) *Joshua de la Place* (Placæus), *Lewis Capellus*, etc It was especially in opposition to their views that the Formula Consensus was drawn up. On *Amyraut*, see *Schweizer* in Zeller's Jahrb., 1852, and

Edmond Sagey, Strasb., 1840. *Herzog's* Realencycl. *sub* Amyraut. On the doctrine of *Pajou*, see *Schweizer* in Theol. Jahrb., 1853. [See the next § 225 *a*.]

[10] Among them were *William Chillingworth* (1602–1644), *Ralph Cudworth* (he died 1688), *Tillotson*, *Stillingfleet*, and others. [See § 225 *b*.]

[11] *Alphonse Turretin* was the son of the strictly orthodox Francis Turretin, born 1671, and died at Geneva A. D. 1737. He wrote: Opuscula Brunsv., 1726, ii. 8.—Dilucidationes phil. theol. et dogmatico-morales, quibus præcipua Capita Theologiæ et naturalis et revelatæ demonstrantur. Lugd. Bal., 1748, iii. 4, and several other works.

[12] *Pictet* was born A. D. 1655, and died A. D. 1724, at Geneva. He composed a Theologia christiana, Gen., 1696, ii. 8.—Medulla Theologiæ, ibid., 1711, 12, and several other works. [Theology, transl. by *Reyroux*, Lond., 1847.]

[13] *Werenfels* was born 1657, and died 1740. (Athenæ rauricæ, p. 57, *Hanhart*, *R.* in the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift. Basle, 1824, part 1, p. 22, part 2, p. 53, ss.) He wrote: Opuscula Theologica. Basil., 1782, iii. 8.

§ 225 *a*.

[THE FRENCH SCHOOL OF SAUMUR.]

[*A. Schweizer*, Centraldogmen, ii. 225–430, 564–663; and article *Amyraut* in *Herzog's* Encycl. *Ebrard*, Dogmatik, i. § 43.]

[Under the influence of *John Cameron*,[1] who succeeded Gomarus at Saumur, in 1618, a modification of the Calvinistic system was introduced into the French Reformed theology, represented by the names of *Amyraut*,[2] *Placæus*,[3] and *Pajon*.[4] Cameron himself taught, after Piscator, the imputation of Christ's passive obedience alone; and advocated the theory of the hypothetic universalism of Divine grace, which was more fully developed by Amyraut. "The peculiarity of Amyraldism," says Schweizer, "is in the combination of a real particularism with a merely ideal universalism."[5] *Placæus* (De la Place), advocated the mediate, instead of the immediate imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity.[6] *Louis Cappel* represented this school in its exegetical services.[7] Though *Dallæus*,[8] and *David Blondel*,[9] defended Amyraldism, and though *Andrew Rivetus*, and even *Du Moulin*,[10] at last acknowledged that such a hypothetical universalism of grace (qua actu nemo salvatur) was at least harmless, yet Heidegger was deputed in Switzerland to draw up against it the Formula Consensus, 1675, which, however, never obtained any general authority.[11]]

[1] [*John Cameron* was born in Glasgow, about 1580; Prof. at Sedan, pastor at Bordeaux, 1608–1618; Prof. at Saumur, 1618–24; died at Montauban, 1625. His Amica Collatio cum Tileno, 1621, is against Arminianism

also his Defensio de Gratia et libero Arbitrio. His principal works (Prælect. Theol. and Myrotheticum Evangel.) were published by the National Synod of France after his death. See *Schweizer*, in *Herzog's* Encycl. *Gass*, 331.]

[2] [*Moses Amyraldus* (Amyraut), was born at Bourgeuil, in Tourraine, 1596; succeeded Daillé at Saumur, 1626; became Prof. there, in 1632. His views were first published in a treatise on Predestination, 1634, and opposed by Du Moulin and Andr. Rivetus. He was acquitted by the French Synod of 1637, and at Charenton, 1644; the charge renewed at Loudun, 1659, but not carried through. He died 1664. Besides numerous exegetical works, he wrote Theses Salmurienses, La Morale Chrétienne, 1652–60, etc. See *Schweizer*, ubi supra. *Walch*, Relig. Streitigkeiten, 1733, i. 454, iii. 736. *Gass*, ii. 328.]

[3] [*Joshua de la Place* (Placæus), born 1596, Prof. at Saumur, 1632, died 1655. The theory of original sin, as consisting only in native corruption, was condemned by the French Synod of 1645, though Placæus himself was not named. He accepted the statement of the Synod, by distinguishing between immediate and mediate imputation. He was opposed by *Anton Garissol*, Prof. in Montauban, and defended by *Chs. Drélincourt*, pastor at Charenton. His defence, De Imputatione primi Peccati, including an examination of the decree of Charenton, was published, 1655, the year of his death. Opera, Franeker, 1699; Aubencit, 1702, 2, 4to. Comp. *A. Schweizer*, in *Herzog's* Encycl., and in Centraldogmen, ii. 319. *Aymar*, Synodes Nat. ii. 778. *Gass*, ii. 347.]

[4] [*Claude Pajon*, b. 1626, studied in Saumur; Prof. of theology there, after Amyraut's death, 1666; died 1685. He denied the immediate concursus in providence, and the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit in conversion. See *Schweizer*, ubi supra, ii. 564–663. *Gass*, ii. 359, *sq.*]

[5] [*Schweizer*, in *Herzog* (Am. transl. i. 132), says, the difference between Arminianism and Amyraldism is "an essential one. The Arminian has a *gratia universalis sub conditione fidei*, in *opposition* to the Reformed doctrine of a *gratia particularis absoluta*; the Amyraldian, on the contrary, assumes a *gratia universalis hypothetica* (i. e., *sub conditione fidei*), in order the better to defend the rigid particularism of election according to the Reformed view."]

[6] [*Blondel*, as cited by *Haag*, La France Protestante, iv. p. 308 (Schweizer, ii. 319), says, that Placæus, in opposition to the view of Pighius and Catharini (Rom. Cath.), that sin comes to us only by the imputation of Adam's sin, defended the theses, that corruption could not originate from imputation, and that original sin passed over from Adam to all his descendants.]

[7] [*Cappel* was born 1585, Prof. at Saumur, 1632, died 1658. The Formula Consensus maintained, against him, the inspiration of the Hebrew vowel points. See *Bertheau* in *Herzog*.]

[8] [*John Daillé* (Dallæus), born 1594, from 1626 to 1670, preached in Paris. De Usu Patrum, 1656, and often; Eng. version by Thos. Smith, 1651 (from the French of that year): revised ed. Phila., 1842. On his part in the Amyraldian controversy, see *Schweizer*, ii. 387–439. *Gass*, ii. 345.]

[9] [*David Blondel*, born 1591, died 1655. His Primacy of the Church

appeared 1641. On his relation to the school of Saumur, see *Schweizer*, ii. 304, 305.]

[10] [*Du Moulin* (Peter Molinæus), born 1568, Prof. at Sedan, 1626, died 1658. See *C. Schmidt*, in *Herzog*, and *Schweizer*, ubi supra.]

[11] [On the Formula Consensus, and its fate, see *Schweizer*, ii. 439–542, 663, *sq.* *Gass*, ii. 353–6.]

§ 225 *b*.

[THEOLOGY IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.]

[The Anglican theology, like its polity, was gradually shaped, and occupied an intermediate position between the Roman Catholic and the Reformed systems. Doctrinal controversies were subordinated to ecclesiastical questions. The earlier reformers,[1] *Cranmer*, *Latimer*, *Hooper*, *Ridley*, opposed chiefly the practical abuses of the papacy. The exiles under Mary returned (1559) from Frankfort, Zurich, and Geneva, imbued with the principles of the Reformed (Calvinistic) system. But the polity and faith of England, as shaped under Elizabeth, contained conflicting elements, represented respectively by the Book of Common Prayer, and the Thirty-Nine Articles (which latter were Calvinistic).[2] An intermediate position was occupied by *Jewel*,[3] *Grindal*, *Pilkington*, and Abp. *Parker*.[4] The Puritan principles were advocated by *Hooper*,[5] *Thos. Cartwright*,[6] *Wm. Perkins*.[7] As late as 1578, Calvin's Catechism was ordered to be used in the University of Cambridge. The Lambeth Articles of 1595,[8] taught the strictest scheme of predestination. Ireland was represented by the learning and orthodoxy of archbishop *Usher*.[9] Scotland, with the Presbyterian system, also received from *John Knox* the principles of the school of Geneva, advocated by *Andrew Melville*, *Henderson*, and others.[10] At the end of the sixteenth century, and beginning of the seventeenth, the Anglican system was represented by *Richard Hooker*,[11] and others ;[12] the episcopal system was defended by *Donne*, *Field*, *Andrews*, and *Jackson*.[13] Abp. *Laud*,[14] pressed the high church and sacramentarian tendencies, in conjunction with Arminian views, (*Montagu* and *Mainwaring*,)[15] to their extreme consequences, opposed in vain by the moderate Puritans,[16] *Davenant*, Bp. *Reynolds*, Bp. *Hall*, *Williams*, *Carleton*, and *Barlow*. The conflict of the systems resulted in the temporary triumph of Presbyterianism and Calvinism in the *Westminster Assembly*,[17] followed by the reaction under the Restoration (Charles II.) The Anglican system was subsequently developed and expounded in a prolific and learned theological literature, which had for its ideal the theology of the church of

the first four or five centuries, (Bp. *Bull*,[18] *Jeremy Taylor*,[19] *Isaac Barrow*,[20] Bp. *Cosin*,[21] Abp. *Bramhall*,[22] *Stillingfleet*, *Waterland*, *Sherlock*, Abps. *King* and *Wake*, and was ably defended in its main doctrinal position by the non-jurors, Hickes, Leslie, Kettlewell, Johnson, Brett, and others).[23] It reached the term of its development about the close of this period (1720). It was exhibited in its most systematic form in the works of *Beveridge*,[24] *Pearson*,[25] and *Burnet*.[26] Yet there were not wanting those in the established church, who still advocated the main principles of the Reformed theology (Abp. *Leighton*,[27] *South*,[28] *Ez. Hopkins*, *Manton*, *Barlow*, and others.[29]) The more distinctive Puritan theology was advocated chiefly by the non-conformists, in thorough treatises and practical works by *Charnock*,[30] *Thomas Watson*,[31] *W. Bates*,[32] *William Twisse*,[33] by *Flavel* and *Bunyan*,[34] by *Thos. Goodwin*, and many others ;[35] and in a stricter and more comprehensive method by *Richard Baxter*,[36] *John Owen*,[37] *John Howe*,[38] *Theoph. Gale*,[39] *Thos. Ridgeley*,[40] *Matthew Henry* and *Calamy*.[41] The Antinomian tendency was represented by *Crisp*.[42] The Scotch divines,[43] and the New England[44] colonists from Great Britain remained faithful to the strict Calvinistic tradition.]

[There were also other phases of theological opinion, of a less permanent influence. A Platonizing tendency was represented by *Cudworth*,[45] *More* and *Norris*,[46] *John Smith*, of Cambridge, *Gale*, *Culverwell*, and others.[47] Under Latitudinarianism was included a somewhat undefined class, as *John Milton*,[48] *Chillingworth*,[49] archbishop *Tillotson*,[50] *Samuel Clark*,[51] *Patrick*, *Whitby*, *Sykes*, *Whiston*, and others.[52] (The most important doctrinal controversy was the Trinitarian, in which *Bull*, *Waterland*, *Samuel Clarke*, *Whiston*, *Sherlock*, *Watts*, *South*, *Stillingfleet*, and *Allix*, bore a part. See § 234, 262.)]

[1] [The works of the early English Reformers are published most completely by the Parker Society, 1840–1855, in 55 vols. Legh Richmond's Fathers of the English Church, 8 vols., 1807–1812, contains the works of *Frith*, *Barnes*, *Lancelot*, *Ridley*, and other confessors under Henry VIII. *Thomas Cranmer* was born 1589, Abp. Canterb., 1532, burnt at the stake, Oxford, Mar. 25, 1556. He had chief part in drawing up the Prayer Books (1549, 1552), the Catechism of 1548, and the XLII. Articles of 1553. In the Homilies, he wrote that on Justification, 1547. Cranmer's Bible, 1539. Works, Miscel. Writings and Letters, ed. J. E. Coxe, for Parker Soc., 2 vols., 1844. Defence of Sacrament, 1550; and Answer to Stephen Gardner, on Eucharist, 1580, 4to. (Lat. transl. of Defence by Sir John Cheke, 1557). Works by Jenkyas, 4, 8vo., 1834. Life by Strype, Le Bas, H. J. Todd, and others. Compare Rev. *J. J. Blunt*, in Quarterly Review, rep. in his Essays, 1860. On Cranmer and his theological position, see Correspondence between the Bp. of Exeter and T. B. Macaulay, Lond., 1861. *Hugh Latimer*, b. 1470; bp. Worcester, 1535; burnt at Oxford, 1555.

Works by *G. E. Corrie*, for Parker Soc., 2 vols., 1845 (with Life by Watkins, 2 vols., 1824.) Life by G. L. Duyckink, N. Y., 1861.—*Nicholas Ridley*, bishop of Rochester, 1548, of London, 1550, burnt, 1555. Works, for Parker Soc., by *H. Christmas*, 1841.]

[2] [See above § 222, note 6. See also note 15 below. In the Arian controversy, Dr. Waterland in his "Case of Arian Subscription," took the ground against Clarke, that an Arian could not subscribe, to which *Sykes* replied, that an Arian might, as well as an Arminian, since the Articles were Calvinistic. Waterland published a "Supplement." See also *Toplady*, 1769, and again, 1774, "Historic Proof of the Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England," 2 vols. *Overton*, True Churchman Ascertained, 1801, on the same side; in reply, Archb. *Daulenу*, Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, and *Dean Kipling*, Articles of the Church of Eng. proved to be not Calvinistic. *Dr. Richard Laurence*, Reg. Prof. in Oxf., the Bampton Lect., 1844, 4th ed., 1853, viz., An Attempt to illustrate those Ar icles of the Church of England, improperly considered Calvinistic. Bp. *Tomline*, Refutation of Calvinism, 1811. *W. B. Matthias*, of Dublin, Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Reformation, on the Calvinistic side; and also *Ed. Williams* (b. 1730, d. 1813), Defence of Modern Calvinism against Bp. Tomline, 1812. *W. Goode* (Dean of Ripon), the Doctrine of the Church of England as to the Effects of Baptism in the Case of Infants, enters largely into the same topic. See also *Thos. Scott*, Evang. Doctrine defended against Bp. *Tomline*, in his works, vols. 7 and 8. Comp. Brit. and For. Ev. Rev., Jan., 1861, on Theology of Church of England.]

[3] [*John Jewel*, b. 1522, bp. of Salisbury, 1560, died, 1571. "The Church of England may be best studied in the writings of Jewel:" *Warburton*. "It may be said of his surname, *nomen omen*:" *Fuller*. His Apologia Eccles. Anglic., 1522. (Eng. transl. by Lady Ann Bacon, 1562, and several others, last by *Russell*, Oxf., 1840), and Defence of the same against *Hardinge*, 1567, have been often reprinted. Works, 1609, 1611, etc.; ed. by *Jelf*, 8 vols., 1847–8, and for Parker Soc., by *Ayre*, 4, 1845–50. Life by *Le Bas*, 1835, and in *Wordsworth's* Eccles. Biog.]

[4] [*Edmund Grindel* (Gryndall), b. 1517, bp. London, 1559, abp. York, 1570, of Canterb., 1575, d. 1583. Remains, for Parker Soc., by *Nicholson*, 1843. Life, by Strype, 1710.—*James Pilkington*, b. 1520, bp. Durham, 1561, d. 1575. Works, for Parker Soc., by Scholefield, 1842.—*Matthew Parker*, b. 1504, abp. Canterb., 1559, d. 1575; revised Bishop's Bible, 1568; De Antiq. Brit. Eccl., 1605.]

[5] [*John Hooper*, b. 1495, bp. Worcester and Gloucester, 1550; martyr, 1554. Works, for Parker Soc., by *Carr* and *Nevinson*, 2 vols., 1843–52. "The first Puritan." *Hopkins'* Hist. of Puritans, Bost., 1858, vol. i.]

[6] [*Thos. Cartwright*, b. 1535, Prof. Canbr., 1570–1, died 1603. Contest with Whitgift on the Admonition to Parliament, 1638, involving the questions of episcopacy and the liturgy.—*John Whitgift*, b. 1530, Prof. Div. Camb., 1663, abp. Cant., 1583, d. 1603. Works, by Parker Soc., ed. *John Ayre*, 3, Camb., 1851–4. Life, by Stryke; by Sir E. Paul; *Wordsworth's* Eccl. Biog. *Cooper's* Athenæ Cantabrig., vol. ii. (1586–1609) describes 92 works written by or ascribed to Whitgift.]

[7] [*William Perkins*, b. 1558, d. 1602. Works, 3 fol., Lond., 1616. Ethica Christ., Basil, 1609. His Anatomy of Conscience, the first methodical work in practical theology. *William Whitaker*, b. 1547, Prof. at Cambridge, 1579, d. 1595, also a Calvinist. On Bellarmine, Parker Soc., 1849. Works, Genev., 1610, 2, fol.—*John Preston*, b. 1587, d. 1628. See works in *Darling*, Cycl. Bibl. *Ralph Brownrig*, bp. Exeter, b. 1592, d. 1659.]

[8] [The *Nine Lambeth Articles*, were occasioned by Peter Baroe (French) Prof. in Cambridge, and Barret, of Caius College, teaching universal redemption; they inculcated predestination and reprobation. They had no formal church sanction in England, but were adopted by the Dublin Convocation, in Ireland, 1615. "*The Reformation in England ended by showing itself a decidedly Calvinistic movement*;" Christ. Remembrancer, Lond., 1845. The theological professors at Cambridge and Oxford were Calvinistic for fifty years from Elizabeth's accession. Bucer and Peter Martyr were called by Cranmer to the chairs of divinity in Cambridge and Oxford, during the reign of Edward. Cranmer, too, in 1552, invited Calvin, Bullinger, and Melancthon to England, to aid in drawing up a Confession of Faith for the Protestant churches. Calvin's Consensus Genevensis (on Predestination), also had influence upon the framers of the Articles; see Zurich Letters (by Parker Soc.) vol. 3, p. 325, where a letter by Traheron, dean of Chichester, to Bullinger is given, in which he says: "The greater number among us, of whom I own myself to be one, embrace the opinion of John Calvin, as being perspicuous and agreeable to Holy Scripture." See on the whole subject, Brit. and For. Evang. Rev., June, 1861, on Melancthon and the theology of the Church of England. The same article, p. 214, cites from bp. Jewel's letter to Peter Martyr, 1562, after the articles had been passed: "As to matters of doctrine, we have pared everything away to the very quick, and do not differ from your doctrine by a nail's breadth." Zurich Letters, 2d series, p. 59. See Princeton Review, July, 1855, on Zurich Letters and Character of the English Reformation.]

[9] [*James Usher*, b. 1580, bp. Meath, 1620; abp. Armagh., 1624, d. 1655. Whole works, by *Elrington*, 16 vols., 8vo., Dubl., 1847, *sq.* (vol. 3, on Rom. Cath. Controversy; vol. 4, Gottschalcus de Predest.; vol. 7, De Symbol. Apostol.; vols. 8–10, Annals, etc). He proposed a modified episcopacy. Body of Divinity, 3d ed. fol., 1648 (which "he permitted, though not liking the whole;" see Notes and Qu. iv.)]

[10] [*John Knox*, b. at Gifford, East Lothian, 1505; Geneva, 1552–5; died, 1572. Conf. of Faith, 1560. Book of Discipline, 1560. Hist. of Ref., 1584, 1732. Works by *Laing*, 4 vols., 1846, *sq.* Life, by *Thos. McCrie*, Edinb., 1840.—*Andrew Melville*, b. 1545, Principal St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, 1580; Prof. at Sedan; d. 1622. Life, by McCrie, 2 vols., 1824. —*Alex. Henderson*, b. 1583, Prof. St. Andrews; leader of the Presbyterians; d. 1646. Life, by *McCrie* and by *John Aiton*, 1836.—*George Gillespie*, in Westminster Assembly, d. 1648; chief work, Aaron's Rod Blossoming, Lond., 1646 (defence of Presbyterianism).—*Robert Baillie*, b. 1599, Principal of Univ. of Glasgow, d. 1662. Letters and Journals (2 vols., 1775), 3 vols. by *Laing*, 1841–3.—*Samuel Rutherford*, b. 1600 (?), Prof.

St. Andrews, 1639, d. 1665. Plea for Presbyterie, 1642; Christ dyi 1647; Letters, 1638 (1824.)]

[11] [*Richard Hooker*, b. 1553 (?), master of Temple, 1585, Prebend of Salisbury, 1591, died 1600. His Ecclesiastical Polity, more than any single work, has given shape to the Anglican divinity: first 4 Books, 1593, fol fifth, 1597; seventh, 1617; sixth and eighth, posthumous, 1648, 4to. interpolated (?). Works, fol., 1723. *Keble's* ed., 1836, 4, 8vo., repr., 3, 8vo., 1841 (New York, 2, 1857.) On first ed., see Notes and Qu. 2d Series, xi. 45. An edition by *B. Hanbury*, 1830, 3, 8vo. (with Life of Cartwright), from the Puritan side. Abridgments, 1705; Dubl., 1773 (Hemming's); Analysis by *Collinson*, 1810. Life, by Isaak Walton, 1665, and often: by *Gauden* (in his ed. of 1662). Comp. *Lowndes'* Brit. Lit. "There is no learning which this man hath not searched into; nothing too hard for his understanding:" *Stapleton.* "The adamantine and imperishable worth of Hooker in his Eccl. Pol.:" *Dr. Parr.* Comp. *Allibone*, Dict. of Authors. The work was in reply to Mr. Travers, of the Temple, who followed the views of Cartwright, whose lectures were prohibited by Abp. Whitgift; Travers published a Memorial, to which Hooker replied.—*Martin Marprelate Tracts*, 1580, *sq.*, repr. as Puritan Discipline Tracts, Lond., 1843. Comp. Maskell's Hist., 1845.]

[12] ["Hooker was not permitted to occupy the field of controversy alone, *Bilson*, *Bancroft*, *Bridges*, *Cosin*, and *Dr. Adrian Saravia*, a German, beneficed in England, appeared on the same side. Bradshaw defended the cause of the Puritans against Bilson, Fenner against Bridges, Morrice against Cosin, and Beza against Saravia, although the press was shut against them by law, and their books could only be published by stealth." *Bogue*, cited by *Allibone*, u. s.—*Thos. Bilson*, b. 1536, d. 1616; bp. Worcester, 1596, of Winchester, 1597: The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church, 1593, and often; new ed. by *Eden*, Oxf., 1842.—*Rd. Bancroft*, b. 1544, abp. Canterb., 1604, d. 1610. His sermon, 12 Jan., 1588, at St. Paul's cross, started afresh the high church claims, and aroused a long controversy. *John Bridges*, bp. Oxford, d. 1618. Defence of Gov. of Church of England, 1587.—*Cosin* (see below).—*Adrian Saravia*, b. at Artois, 1531, Prof. Leyden, 1582, Prebendary of Canterb., etc., d. 1613; Divers. Tract. Theol., 1611, etc.—On the same side, *John Overall*, b. 1559, bp. Norwich, d. 1619: Convocation Book, 1606; repr. Oxf., 1844. *Rd. Crakanthorp*, b. 1567, chaplain to Charles I., d. 1624; Defens. Eccl. Angl., 1625, new ed. in Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol., 1844. *Henry Hammond*, 1605–1660. Works, 4 fol., 1774.—*Henry Thorndike*, Prebendary of Westminster, d. 1672. Theol. Works in Lib. of Angl. Cath. Theol., 5 vol., 1844, *sq.* On Government of Churches; of Religious Assemblies; Principles of Christ. Truth, etc.—*William Bradshaw*, Puritan, b. 1571, d. 1618; on English Puritanism, 1605 (Latin transl. by Ames); on Justification, 1615 (Lat. 1618).—*William Fenner*, b. 1600, d. 1640 (?) Works, fol., Lond., 1658. *Jos. Bingham's* Antiquities (1708–1722, 1726, Latin by *Grischovius*, Hal., 1724–29, 1751;) ed. *Pitman.* 9 vols., 1840; new ed. by *Rd. Bingham*, belong in part to the same controversy. *Wm. Forbes*, b. 1585, bp. Edinb., and died 1634; Considerationes Modestæ; also translated into English.]

[13] [*John Donne*, b. 1573, ordained at the age of 42, d. 1631, an eloquent

preacher and poet; Dryden calls him, "the greatest wit of our nation." Works, fol. 1640, 1644, 1660; new ed. 6 vols., 8vo., by Alford, Oxf., 1839. (Comp. *Allibone*, u. s.)—*Rd. Field*, dean of Gloucester, b. 1561, d. 1610; Of the Church, five Books, 1606, 3d ed. 1635; for Eccl. Hist. Soc., 4 vols., 1847–1852. *Lancelot Andrews*, b. 1555, bp. Winchester, 1618, d. 1626. Ninety-six Sermons, 5, 8vo., Oxf. Lib., 1841–3; Tortura Torti, ibid., 1851; Responsio ad Apolog. Card. Bellarmini, ibid., 1852.—*Thos. Jackson*, dean of Peterborough, b. 1579, d. 1640; originally a Calvinist, became an Arminian. Works, 3 fol., 1673; new ed., Oxf. 12 vols., 1844; 12 Books on the Apost. Creed; Treatise on Church, ed. by *Goode*, 1843. Synoptical Table of his works, *J. H. Todd*, 1838. *Thos. Fuller*, b. 1608, Prebend. Sarum, d. 1661, Church Hist. Britain, *Nichols'* ed., 3 vols., 1837. Worthies of England; Holy War; Holy State, etc.]

[14] [*William Laud*, b. 1573, abp. Canterb., 1633, beheaded, 1645. Remains, by *Henry Wharton*, 2 fol., 1695–1700. Works, in Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol., Oxf., 5 vols., 1847, *sq.* Life, by *C. Wibb Le Bas*, 1836; by *J. P. Lawson*, 1829; also by *Heylin*, 1668, and *Prynne*. Conference between Laud and Fisher (vol. 2 of works). On his Corresp. with Vossius, see Church Rev., Jan., 1854. Comp. Brit. Critic, vi. xix. New York, Rev., x.]

[15] [*Richard Montagu* (Mountague), b. 1578, bp. of Chichester and Norwich, 1638, d. 1641. Analect. Eccles. Exercitat., fol., 1622. On Baronius, Orig. Eccl. i., 1636. Acts and Monum. of the Church, 1642. Montagu was Laud's agent in introducing Arminian views. He published, 1625, his Appello-Cæsarem, to show that the formularies of the church allowed Calvinism; replied to by bp. Carleton, of Chichester, see next note. In 1630, the jurist, *Prynne*, published his "Anti-Arminianism, or the Church of England's old antithesis to new Arminianism; in which he said that up to that time only five men in England had publicly defended Arminian views viz., Barret and Baroe (note 8). Thompson, who wrote against the Perseverance of the Saints, to which Prof. Abbot, bp. of Salisbury, replied; Montagu and Dr. Thos. Jackson, who was originally a Calvinist.—*Peter Heylin's* Historia Quinqu-Articularis, 1659, is a prejudiced and untrustworthy work on the Arminian side: replied to by *Henry Hickman*, in his Animadversiones, 1673. Comp. Brit. and For. Ev. Rev., Jan., 1861. An anonymous work by *Samuel Hoard*, rector of Morton, or Moreton, in Essex, was published in 1633, entitled, God's Love to Mankind, manifested by disproving his Absolute Decree for their Damnation. Bp. Davenant replied to it in his Animadversione, 1641. Dr. William Twisse also answered it, 1653. And Amyraut, of Saumur, refuted it in his elaborate treatise, Doctrinæ Joannis Calvini de absoluto Reprobationis Decreto Defensio adversus Scriptorem anonymum, 4to., Salmurii, 1641. *John Hales*, b. 1584; at Synod of Dort, 1618; d. 1656. Golden Remains, 1673. Letters from Dort, etc. Works, by *Lord Hailes*, 3 vols., 1765. It is said that Hales became an Arminian at the Synod of Dort. On *Jackson*, see note 13, above.—On King James's injunction to bishops, respecting Dort, see *Neal's* Hist. Puritans, vol. 2; *Peter Heylin's* Hist. of the Five Articles.]

[16] [*John Davenant*, b. 1576, bishop of Salisbury, 1621, d. 1641. Treatise on Justification, 1631 (in Latin), transl., 2, 8vo., Lond., 1844–6. Ex-

position of Colos., 1627, transl. with Life, by *Josiah Allport*, 2 vols., 1831. De Morte Christi et de Prædest., fol., Cantab., 1630. Pralect. de Justitia habituali, 1631, etc. *Joseph Hall*, b. 1574, at Synod of Dort, bp. Exeter, 1627, of Norwich, 1641, d. 1656. New ed. of works, by Pratt, 1808, 10 vols.; by Peter Hall, 12 vols., 1837–9.—*George Carleton*, bishop of Llandaff, 1618, at Synod of Dort, d. 1628. Examination of Montagu on Pelagianism and Arminianism, 1626.—*Ed. Reynolds*, b. 1599, bp. Norwich, 1660, d. 1676. Works, fol., 1658, 1679; 6 vols., 8vo., 1826, by *Rivelay* (new ed. proposed by Nichol, Edinb.) *Ralph Browning*, b. 1592, bp. of Exeter, d. 1659. Serm., fol., Lond., 1645; a very able divine. *John Prideaux*, b. 1578, bp. Worcester, 1641, d. 1659. XXII. Lectiones de totidem Religionis Capitibus, fol., Oxon., 1648. Fasciculus Controvers. Theolog., etc., 1664.]

[17] [See § 224, last paragraph of notes.]

[18] [*George Bull*, b. 1634, bp. St. David's, 1705, d. 1710; Harmonia Apostol. (Paul and James on Justification), 1670, transl. by Wilkinson, 1801. Oxf., 1842. Defensio Fidei Nicenæ, 1685; new transl. Oxf., 2 vols., 1851–2. Judicium Eccles. Cathol.... de necessitate credendi quod.... Jesus Christus sit verus Deus, transl. York, 1825 (for which *Bossuet* transmitted "the congratulations of the whole clergy of France"). Latin works, ed. *Grabe*, 1703. Sermons and Disc., with Life, by *Rob. Nelson*, 4 vols., 1713; 3 vols., 1816, 1840. Works, ed. *Burton*, 8 vols., 1827, 1846. Latin works, transl. in Angl. Cath. Lib.]

[19] [*Jeremy Taylor*, b. 1613, sequestered, 1642, bp. Down and Connor, 1660, d. 1667. Works collected by *Heber*, 15 vols., 1822, 3d ed., 1839; by *Eden*, 10 vols.: Liberty of Prophesying; Unum Necessarium—on Repentance; Deus justificatus—on Original Sin; Real Presence; Dissuasive from Popery; Rule of Conscience, etc. Biography, by *R. A. Wilmott*, 1847.]

[20] [*Isaac Barrow*, b. 1630, Master of Trinity Coll., Cambr., 1672, d. 1677. Theol. works by Tillotson, 3 vols., fol., 1683, vol. 4, 1687; 1741: in 8 vols., Oxf., 1830. Eng. works, New York, 3 vols., 1847. Sermons on Creed. Pope's Supremacy. Comp. *Allibone*.]

[21] [*John Cosin*, b. 1590, bp. Durham, 1663, d. 1672. Works in Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol., Oxf., 5 vols., 1843–53. Scholastical Hist. Canon, 1683; of Transubstantiation, 1676 (in Latin, 1675), etc.

[22] [*John Bramhall*, b. 1593, abp. Armagh, 1662, d. 1663. Works, 5 vols., in Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol., Oxf., 1842–5.]

[23] [*Edward Stillingfleet*, b. 1635, dean St. Paul's, 1678, bp. Worcester, 1689, d. 1699. Works, 6 fol., Lond., 1710. Origines Sacræ (1701, 1837). Orig. Britan., repr, 1842. Unreasonableness of Separation. Doctrine of Christ's satisfaction (1697–1700). Vind. of Trinity. Letters to Locke, 1697. Grounds of Prot. Religion, 2d ed., 1681, repr., 2 vols., 1844. Against Infallibility of Rome, 1673, etc.—*William Sherlock*, dean of St. Paul's, b. 1641, d. 1707. Knowledge of Jesus Christ, 1674. Church Unity, 1681. Summary of Controversies with Church of Rome. Preservative against Popery, 1688 (in *Gibson's* Preserv. xi., 104.) Religious Assemblies, etc. —*Daniel Waterland*, b. 1683, archd. of Middlesex, 1730, d. 1740. Works, 11 vols. in 12, Oxf., 1823–28; 6 vols., 1843; Life, by bp. *Van Mildert*. Vindication of Christ's Divinity in Reply to Clarke. Moyer Lectures. Hist.

of Athanasian Creed. Importance of Doctrine of Trinity. Regeneration Eucharist, etc.—Abp. *King*, b. 1650, bp. Derry, 1691, abp. Dublin, 1702, d. 1729. De Origine Mali, 1702; Origin of Evil, ed. by *Edm. Law*, 4th ed. 1758. Divine Predest., 1710, 1815, by Whately, 1821. Key to Divinity, Part 1, 1715.—*Peter Heylin*, b. 1600, Prebend. Westminst., 1631, d. 1662. Theologia Veterum, on Apostles' Creed, fol., Lond., 1673. Hist. of Ref. of Chh. of Eng., 1674; 2 vols., 1849; by *Robertson*, for Eccl. Hist. Soc., etc. —*George Hickes*, b. 1642, non-juring bp. of Thetford, 1694, d. 1715. On Christ. Priesthood, 4th ed., 2 vols., Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol., Oxf., 1847. Order of Lord's Supper. Controversial Discourses, 1705, 3d ed., 1727, etc. —*Chs. Leslie* (non juror), d. 1722. Theol. Works, 2 fol., 1721, 7 vols., Oxf., 1832. *John Kettlewell* (non-juror), b. 1653, d. 1695. Works, 2 fol., 1719. —*Matthew Scrivener*, Course of Divinity, fol., 1674.—*John Johnson*, Vicar of Cranbrook, b. 1662, d. 1725 (a non juror). The Unbloody Sacrifice, 2 vols., in Oxf. Lib., 1847. Collect. of Eccl. Laws, 2, 1720, Oxf. 1850–1; Discourses, etc.—*William Wake*, b. 1657, bp. Lincoln, 1705, abp. Canterb., 1716, d. 1737. Expos. of Doct. of Church of England, and Defence, 1686. Authority of Christian Princes, and Appeal, 1697–8. Comm. on Catechism. On Convocation, 1703 (most important of the works on this topic). Transl. of the Epistles of the Fathers. Sermons and Disc.—*Thos. Brett*, non-juror, b. 1667, d. 1743. An Account of Church Government, best ed., 1710. On Tradition, 1718; Liturgies, 1720; Episcopacy, 2d ed., 1728.]

[24] [*William Beveridge*, b. 1636, bp. St. Asaph, 1704, d. 1708. Works, by T. H. Horne, 9 vols., 1824. Eng. Theol. Works, 10 vols., Oxf., 1844–8 (vol. 7 contains the lost MS. Exposition of Art. 31–39, discovered by Routh). On Thirty-Nine Articles; Church Catechism; Thesaurus Theologicus (vols. 9, 10); Codex Canonum, 2 vols., Oxf., 1848. Synodicon: Pandectæ Canonum ab Eccles. Græc. recept., 2 fol., Oxf., 1672–82; Vindication of same, 1679.]

[25] [*John Pearson*, b. 1612, Margaret Prof. Camb., 1661, bp. Chester, 1673, d. 1686. Exposition of the Creed, 3d ed. (last corrected by the author), fol., 1669; 12th ed. 1741; *Dobson's* ed., 1840 (repr. New York); *Burton's* ed., 1847; *Chevallier's*, 1849. Minor Theol. Works, ed. *Churton*, 2 vols., Oxf., 1844. Vind. Epist. S. Ignat., in Cotelerius, and in 2 vols. ed. *Churton*, Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol., Oxf., 1852. Annals St. Paul, Camb., 1825.]

[26] [*Gilbert Burnet*, b. 1643, Prof. in Glasgow, 1669, bp. Salisbury, 1689, d. 1714–15. Expos. of XXXIX. Articles, 1699, fol., revised ed. *J. R. Page*, 1843, repr. New York. Vind. of Ordinations of England, 1677 (in *Gibson's* Preservation, 2, 109.) Hist. Ref. Ch. Engl., vol. i. 1679, vol. ii. 1681, vol. iii. 1715 (The only work for which the English Parliament voted public thanks, with a request for its continuation. *Bossuet* was employed upon a reply); 7 vols., Oxf., 1829; 2 royal 8vo., By Nares, 4 vols. (restoring suppressed passages). Hist. of his Own Times, posthumous, 1724–34. For his other works, see *Allibone*, *Lowndes*, *Darling*.]

[27] [*Robert Leighton*, b. 1613, principal Univ. Edinburg, Abp. Glasgow, 1670–4, d. 1684. Exposition of Creed. Theolog. Lectures (Prælect. Theol., Lond., 1808.) Comm. on 1st Peter. Works by *Pearson*, 4 vols., 1830; also in 2 vols.]

[28] [*Robert South*, b. 1633, Prebend. of Westminster, 1663, d. 1716 Sermons, 7 vols., Oxf., 1823; 5 vols., 1842; Lond. 4 vols. 1843; 2 vols., 1850. Animadversions on Sherlock's Trinity, 1693.]

[29] [*Ezekiel Hopkins*, b. 1633, bp. of Derry, 1681, d. 1690. Works fol., 1710; 4 8vo., 1809; 2 8vo., 1841, with life by *Pratt*. Doctrines of Two Covenants, 1712.—*Thomas Manton*, b. 1620, d. 1677: "The best collector of sense of the age," *Charnock*. Works, 5 fol. (see in *Darling*, Cycl. Bibl., not complete; new ed. projected by Nichol, Edinb.)—*John Edwards*, b. 1637, d. 1716. Theologia Reformata, 2 fol., Lond., 1713; Theol. Ref. (practical part), fol., 1726. Replies to Whitby, Clarke, Abp. King (on Predest.)—*Anthony Tuckney*, b. 1599, Reg. Propat., Cambr., 1661, d. 1670. Forty Sermons, 1776, etc.—*Thomas Barlow*, b. 1607, bp. Lincoln, 1675, d. 1691, a learned Calvinistic divine. Popery, 1679. Brutum Fulmen (bull of Pius V. against Elizabeth), 1681. Rights of Bishops, 1680. Misel. Cases and Genuine Remains (posthumous, against B.'s wish, by Sir Peter Pett, 1690–1, etc.]

[30] [*Stephen Charnock*, b. 1628, d. 1680. Works (posthumous) 2 fol., Lond., 1682–3; 9 vols., 8vo., 1815, by *Ed. Parsons*, with Memoir. Disc. on the Attributes, 2 vols., 1834, New York, with life, by *Symington*, 1856. "Perspicuity and depth; metaphysical subtlety and evangelical simplicity;" *Toplady*. A new ed. of his works to be published by Nichol, Edinb.]

[31] [*Thos. Watson*, educated at Cambridge, minister in Lond., 1646–62, d. 1689. A Body of Divinity, on the Assembly's Catechism, fol., 1692–1741, New York, 1856.]

[32] [*William Bates*, b. 1625, d. 1699. Harmony of Divine Attributes in Redemption of Man, 1697. The Four Last Things, 1691. Works, 4 8vo., by *Farmer*, Lond., 1815. Vitæ Select. Virorum (anonym.), Lond., 1681.]

[33] [*William Twisse*, b. 1575, Prolocutor of Westminster Assembly, in 1643. Opera, 3 fol., Amst., 1652 (De Vindiciis Gratiæ, agst. Arminius; De Scientia Media). Edited (with Savile) Bradwardine's De Causa Dei 1618.]

[34] [*John Flavel*, b. 1627, non-conform., d. 1691. Whole works, 2 fol., 1701, 1740; 6 vols., Lond., 1820. Fountain of Life. Method of Grace, 1698. Pneumatologia, 1698. Expos. of Catechism, 1692.—*John Bunyan*, b. 1628, d. 1688. He wrote as many works as he lived of years (60). *Pilgrim's Progress* ("the best Summa Theol. Evangelicæ ever produced by a writer not miraculously inspired," *Coleridge*), original ed. repr. by *Offer*, 1849. Works, 2 fol., 1692, and often; 6 vols. by *Mason*, 1684; best ed. by *Offer*, 3 vols., 1853. (Doctrines of Law and Grace. Defence of Justif. by Faith. Life by *Southey*, *Offer*, *Philip*, 1839), etc. On edition of Pilg. Prog., see Princeton Rev., 1859. Bunyan not the author of Vision of Heaven and Hell; see Notes and Qu., 1st series, iii. iv. *Cheever's* Lect. on Pilgrim's Progress.]

[35] [*Thos. Goodwin*, b. 1600, member of West. Assembly, Prest. of Magdalen Coll., Oxf., 1649, d. 1679. Works, 5 fol., 1681.—*Anthony Burgess*, (Indp.) also of the Assembly; Vindiciæ Legis, 1646. True Doctrine of Justif., 1655.—*Jerem. Burroughes*, (Indp.), b. 1599, d. 1646; see *Darling*, u s.—*Thos. Doolittel*, 1630–1707, Complete Body of Divinity, 1723, etc.—

Geo. Walker, 1581–1651: Socinianism and Justif., 1641. The works of *Sibbs*, 1577–1635, *Thos. Adams*, *Brooks*, d. 1680, *D. Clarkson*, (co-pastor with Owen), 1622–86, Puritan Divines, to be republished by Nichol, Edinb., 1861, *sq.*]

[36] [*Richard Baxter*, b. 1615, minister at Kidderminster, 1640, d. 1691. He published 168 treatises. Practical Works, 4, fol., 1707; 23, 8vo., 1830, and 4, imp. 8vo. Life by *Orme*. Christian Ethics, Ecclesiastics, and Politics. Gildas Salvianus, the Reformed Pastor. Reformed Liturgy. Saints' Rest. Aphorisms on Justif., 1649, and Conf. of Faith, 1655; of Justif., 1658. Methodus Theol. Christianæ, 1681. Catholick Theologie, 1675. (See list of works in Darling's Cycl. Bibl.)—His theological system has been termed Baxterian, intermediate between Calvinism and Arminianism.]

[37] [*John Owen*, the most eminent of the Independent divines, b. 1616, d. 1683. Works by *Russell*, 21 vols., 1826; and Comm. on Heb., 7 vols.; new ed., by *Goold*, Edinb., 16 vols. Life by *Orme*. Disc. concerning Holy Spirit. Display of Arminianism. Saints' Perseverance. Vindiciæ Evangelicæ (agst. Socinians). Justification by Faith. Christologia—the Power of Christ. *Θεολογουμενα παντοπαδα*, sive de Natura, Ortu.... veræ Theol., Brem., 1684.]

[38] [*John Howe*, b. 1630, minister in London, d. 1675. Works, 2 fol., 1724, with life, by Calamy; 3 vols., 1848, ed. by *Hewlett*; by Hunt, 8 vols., 1810–20. New ed., Edinb., 1856, *sq.* Life by *Rogers*, 1836. Living Temple ("a masterpiece of profound argumentation;" *Williams*. Part 2 contains Animadversions on Spinoza). Blessedness of Righteous. Work of Holy Spirit. Possibility of a Trinity in God. God's Prescience ("the most profound, most philosophical, and most valuable of his writings;" *Robert Hall*). The Redeemer's Dominion over the Invisible World.]

[39] [*Theophilus Gale*, b. 1628, d. 1678. The Court of the Gentiles, 1672 (the original of human literature from the Scriptures); Bk. 2 is on Divine Predetermination, a vindication of Calvinism. A Discourse of Christ's Coming. Philosophia Generalis, 1676. The Ars Sciendi, ascribed to Gale by Wood, is denied by Calamy to be his.]

[40] [*Thos. Ridgeley*, b. 1667, began an academy for divinity, Lond., 1712, d. 1734. Body of Divinity. Lectures on the Assembly's Larger Catechism, 2, fol., Lond., 1731–33; 4, 8vo., 1844; 2 vols., 1844; New York, 1855. Doctrine of Original Sin, 8vo., Lond., 1725.]

[41] [*Matthew Henry*, b. 1662, minister at Chester and Hackney, d. 1714. Exposition of Old and New Test. (from Romans to the end by other hands). Miscel. Works, with an Appendix on what Christ is made to believers, by *P. Henry*, Lond., 1830. *Edward Calamy*, 1671–1732. Exercit. Philos., 1688. Defence of Nonconformity, 3 vols., 1703–5. Inspiration, 1700. On Trin. (1 J. v. 7), 1722. Nonconform. Memorial, 3 vols., 1802. Autobiog., ed. *Rutt*, 1830.]

[42] [*Tobias Crisp*, b. 1600, rector of Brinkworth, d. 1642. Christ Alone Exalted, 1643; with Notes by *Gill*, 4th ed., 2 vols., Lond., 1791. Crisp had "52 opponents", among them, Williams, Edwards, Lorimer, Baxter (1690). See *Nelson's* Life of Bull. His son, *Samuel Crisp*, publ. Christ made Sin, 1691; new ed., 2 vols., 1832.]

[43] [*David Calderwood*, b. 1575, deprived for opposing episcopacy; in Holland, 1617–23; d. 1650. Hist. of Kirk of S., 1678; by Wodrow Soc., 8 vols., 1842–9. Altar of Damascus, 1621; enlarged Altare Damascen., 1708, against Episcopacy. *Robert Wodrow*, 1679–1734, Hist. of Sufferings of Ch. of S., 4 vols., 1838; Correspondence, ed. McCrie, Edinb., 3 vols., 1842–3. See also Wodrow Soc. Miscellany, by *D. Laing*, vol. i. 1844.—*Thomas Halyburton*, b. 1674, Prof. St. Andrews, d. 1712. Works, Lond., 1835. On Faith. Natural Religion Insufficient. On Justification, etc. *Thos. Boston*, of Ettrick, 1676–1732. Works, fol., 1767; 12, 8vo., 1852, ed. by *S. McMillan*. Complete Body of Divin. (vol. 1, 2). Quest. in Div. (vol. 6). Human Nature in its Fourfold State (vol. 8). *Robert Fleming*, b. 1630, minister at Cambuslang, d. 1694.; Fulfilling of Scripture, 1726; his son, *Rob. Fleming*, d. 1716; Christology, 3 vols., Lond., 1703–8; Disc., 1701; Rise and Fall of Papacy.]

[44] [The early New England colonists carried to the New World the Puritan form of Calvinism. Many of its first pastors and teachers were men trained in the universities of England. The Confession and Catechism of the Westminster Assembly were adopted by the Cambridge Synod of 1648 (excepting in respect to church government); the Savoy Conf. by the Boston Synod of 1680. At Saybrook, Connecticut, 1708, the Westminster and Savoy Conf., and the XXXIX. Articles were sanctioned.—Antinomian Controversy (1636–7) in Boston (*Mrs. Ann Hutchinson*), her opinions condemned by Newtown Synod, 1637. Half-Way Covenant Controver. 1657–62.—*John Robinson*, b. 1575, about 1606 at Scrooby, 1609 in Leyden, Holland, d. 1625 (6)—never in New England, but his church (*Brewster*) emigrated to Plymouth. Works, 3 vols., 1851, by Cong. Bd.: Controversy with Episcopius, 1613; Defence of Doctrine of Dort, 1624.—*John Cotton*, b. 1585, d. 1682, head lecturer in Trinity College, Camb., in Boston 1633, shaped the polity of the churches, opposed Antinomianism; Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven, 1644; Vindiciæ Clavium; Way of the Churches against Baylie and Rutherford, 1648, etc.—*Thos. Hooker*, b. 1586, in Cambridge 1633, in Hartford, Ct., 1636, d. 1647; Survey of Sum of Church Discipline, 1648.—*John Norton*, b. 1606, Ipswich, 1638, Boston, 1655, d. 1663; Letter to Dury: Responsio ad totum Quæst. Syllogen a....Guil. Apollonio propos., etc., Lond., 1648 (first Latin book written in New England, at the request of Apollonius and the divines of Zealand, on church controversies in England); Disc. of Sufferings of Christ, 1653 (by order of the General Court); The Orthodox Evangelist, 4to., 1654, etc. Life by *Mather*.—*Thos. Shepard*, b. 1605, minister Camb., (N. E.) 1635, d. 1649; on Liturgies, Power of Keys, etc., 1653; Parable of Ten Virgins, 1660, 1663, Aberd. 1838. The Sound Believer, 1671. Meditat., 1791. Works, Cong. Bd. See *Allen* and *Sprague*.—*Richard Mather*, b. 1596, Dorchester 1636, d. 1669; on Justif., 1662; Reply to Rutherford, 1646, etc.; see *Wood's* Athen. Oxon. ii. 427. His son, *Increase Mather*, b. 1639, Prest. Harvard, 1681, d. 1723. Numerous works: see *Allen's* Biog. Dict. *Cotton Mather*, son of latter, b. 1663, minister Bost. 1684, d. 1728. He published 382 works; see *Allen*, u. s. Magnalia Christi Americana, in 7 books, fol., 1702, repr. Hartford, 2, 8vo. Christ. Philosopher, 1721. *John Davenport*, of New Haven, b. 1597, d. 1670.

—*John Eliot*, apostle to Indians, b. 1604, d. 1690; Christ. Commonwealth, 1650; *Indian* Bible, 1661–4, first Bible printed in America. Life by *C. Francis*.—*Samuel Willard*, b. Jan. 31, 1639–40, minister Boston, 1678, d. 1707; Body of Divinity in 250 Lect. on Assembly's Catechism, fol. Bost., 1726. Comp. *J. F. Stearns*, in Am. Theol. Rev., Aug., 1860.]

[46] [*Ralph Cudworth*, b. 1617, educated at Cambridge, Prof. Hebrew, 1645, d. 1688. The True Intellectual System of the Universe, fol., 1678; 2, 4to, 1742, and life by *Birch*; repr. 2, 8vo., at Andover (New Eng.), 1837, with Treatise on Immutable Morality, 1731; 3, 8vo., 1845, with transl. of Mosheim's notes; True Notion of Lord's Supper, 1670, and often; Sermon on 1 John ii. 3, 4, against Antinomians. Systema Intellectuale, ed. Mosheim, 2, fol., Jen., 1733; 2, 4to., L. Bat, 1773. "The Latin transl. is greatly to be preferred:" *Warburton*. On Free-will, with notes by John Allen, 1838. A number of Cudworth's unpublished MS. are in the British Museum; *e. g.*, on Liberty and Necessity; the Notion of Hobbes concerning God and Spirit. *Paul Janet*, Essai sur le médiateur plastique de Cudworth, Paris, 1860.]

[46] [*Henry More*, b. 1614, d. 1687. Theological Works, fol., Lond., 1708. (Mystery of Godliness. Mystery of Iniquity. Grounds of Certainty of Faith. Antidote against Idolatry). Collection of Philosoph. Writings, fol., Lond., 1712. (On Atheism; Enthusiasm; Immortality; Epistol. ad R. Des Cartes; Conjectura Cabbalistica). Discourses, Lond., 1692. Enchiridion Ethicum, Amst., 1695. Divine Dialogues, Glasg., 1743. Opera, 3 fol., Lond., 1675–9. Life by R. Ward, Lond., 1710. Comp. *Vaughan's* Hours with Mystics.—*John Norris*, of Bemerton, 1657, d. 1711: a Cambridge Platonist. Miscellanies, 2d ed., Lond., 1690. Theory and Regulation of Love, 1680. Disc. on Beatitudes, 4 vols., 1699, *sq.* Reason and Faith, 1697. Theory of Ideal World, 2 vols., 1701–4 (his chief work, on basis of Malebranche). Letters to Dodwell, etc.]

[47] [*John Smith*, of Cambridge, b. 1618, d. 1652. Select Discourses, 4to., 1660, 1673, 8vo., 1821 (by *Worthington*), 4th ed. by *H. G. Williams*, with bp. Patrick's Sermon, Camb., 1859.—The Disc. on Prophecy was transl. by Le Clerc for his Commentary on the Prophets. The other Discourses are on True Way of Attaining Divine Knowledge; Superstition; Atheism; Immortality; Existence and Nature of God; Legal and Evang. Righteousness; Excellence and Nobleness of True Religion, etc.—See *Theophilus Gale*, note 39.—*Rd. Cumberland*, b. 1632, bp. Peterborough, 1691, d. 1718. De Legibus Naturæ, 1672, transl. by *Maxwell*, 1727, by Towers, Dubl. 1750, in French by *Barbeyrac*, Amst., 1744. On Sanchoniathon, 1729. Origines Gentium, 1724. *Benjamin Whichcote*, b. 1610, Prof. Div. King's College, d. 1683. Discourses, 4 vols. Aphorisms, in 1703, by *Jeffery*, rep. by *Salter*, 1753. Select Sermons (originally publ. by Lord Shaftesbury), 1792, 1798.—*Nathaniel Culverwel*, (Culverel), d. 1650 or 1651. An elegant and learned Discourse of the Light of Nature (written in 1646) with several other Treatises (The Schism; The Act of Oblivion; The White Stone; Spiritual Optics, first printed 1651), etc., 1652, 4to.; 1654; 1661; 1669. The Light of Nature, ed. by J. Brown, with Essay by Cairns, Edinb., 1857.

This remarkable work anticipated Cumberland's theory (1672) of independent morality; it is not noticed by Stewart, or Mackintosh, or Hallam.—*Francis Lee*, M. D., 1660, d. 1719. Wrote works tinged with Mysticism: Apoleipomena: or Diss. Theol. Mathemat., etc., 2, Lond., 1752. History of Montanism. On Books of Ezra and Esdras, 1722. Prolegomena to the historical part of Grabe's Septuagint. *Samuel Shaw*, b. 1635, d. 1691, rector of Long-Whatton, a divine of the same class: Immanuel, or Discovery of True Religion, 1667, 4th ed. 1804. Also *Joseph Truman*, b. 1631, d. 1672. A Disc. of Natural and Moral Impotency; ed. *H. Rogers*, Lond., 1834; The Great Propitiation, Lond., 1669. See Brown's Preface to Culverwell, ubi supra, p. xxii.—*Robert Fludd* (*De Fluctibus*), M. D., b. 1547, d. 1637, a mystical (Rosicrucian, Cabalistic) philosopher. Works, Oppenheim, 1617–38, 6 vols., fol. Mosaical Philos., transl. Lond., 1659. See *Wood's* Athen. Oxon.]

[48] [*John Milton*, b. 1608, Latin Secretary to Cromwell, d. 1674. Prose Works, by *Toland*, 3, fol., Amst., 1697–8; 2, fol., 1738; 2, 4to., Life by Birch, 1735; Symmond, 7 vols., 1806; 1848–53, 5 vols.; whole works, 8 vols., 1851, Lond. and Boston. Ref. in England; Episcopacy; Reason of Church Gov. (vol. 2); on Smectymnus (vol. 3). De Doctrina Christ. curav. *C. R. Sumner*, 1825, also translated. Life by Keightly, 1855; Masson, vol. 1, 1859. On his Religious Life and Opinions, Bib. Sac., 1859–60, by Barber; the question of the time at which the Christian Doctrine was written—in his earlier life, about 1640? on the basis of Ames and Wollebs.]

[49] [*William Chillingworth*, b. 1602, became a Rom. Cath. through the influence of John Fisher, alias John Perse, but was brought back by Laud, 1631, d. 1644. Religion of Protestants, 1638; 6th ed. with other works, 1704; 10th, fol., 1742; 3, 8vo., Oxf., 1838. Life by M. Des Maizeaux, Lond., 1725. His Religion of Protestants was written in reply to Edward Knott's (real name Matthias Wilson, a Jesuit), Charity Mistaken. Tillotson calls C. "the glory of the age and nation." He also wrote Nine Sermons, 1634; The Apostol. Institution of Episcopacy, 1644. His great work also takes a position in contrast with Hooker's theory of the rightful authority of the national church.]

[50] [*John Tillotson*, b. 1630, Dean St. Paul's, 1689, Abp. Canterb., 1691, d. 1694. Works (254 Discourses), 3, fol., 1752. 12 vols., 1757 (Life by Birch, publ., 1753; vol. xiii. Rule of Faith, 3d ed., 1688.]

[51] [*Samuel Clarke*, b. 1673, rector St. James', Westminster, 1709, d. 1729. He aided in displacing the Cartesian by the Newtonian system (ed. *Rohault's* Physics). Boyle Lectures, Demonstr. of Being and Attrib. of God, and Obligations of Nat. Rel., 2 vols., 1705–6. Script. Doctrine of Trinity, 1712 (provoked a long controversy: Waterland, Whitby, Nelson, Jackson, etc.) Collect. of Papers bet. C. and Leibnitz, 1717; on Collins on Liberty, 1717 (in French by Des Maizeaux, 1720). Letter to Dodwell on Immortality, etc. Sermons. Works, life by Hoadly, 4, fol., 1738.]

[52] [*Symon Patrick*, bp. Ely, b. 1626, d. 1707. On Communion, 1685, Tradition, 1683, the Eucharist, etc., Comm. on the O. and N. Test. and Apoc. (Lowth, Arnold, Whitby, and Lowman, added), new ed., 4 vols. 1853,

—*Daniel Whitby*, b. 1638, Prebend. Salisbury, 1688, d. 1726; Arminian and at last Arian. Protestant Reconciler, 1683 (retracted). On Dodwell, 1707. On the Five Points, 1710. De Imput. Peccati Adami, 1711; transl. by *Heywood*, 1739. Ethices Comp., 1713. Disquis. Modestæ (on Bull, replied to by Waterland, and rejoinder by Whitby), 1720, etc.—*Arthur Ashley Sykes*, b. 1684, Prebend. Salisbury and Winchester, d. 1756. Controversies with Collins, S. Clarke, Warburton, Middleton. Script. Doctr. of Redemption, 1756. Resurrection. On Sacrifice. Memoirs by *Disney*, 1785.—*William Whiston*, b. 1667, Prof. Math. Cambr., expelled for Arianism, 1710, d. 1752. Boyle Lect. on Prophecy, 1708. Prim. Christianity revived, 5 vols., 1711–12. Text of Old Test., 1722. Hist. O. and N. Test., 6 vols., 1745. Prim. New Test., 1745. Liturgy of Church of England reduced, 1750. Memoirs, 3 vols., 1749–50, etc.]

III. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

§ 226.

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT, AND THE CATECHISMUS ROMANUS.

†*Sarpi* [P. Soave Pol.], Istoria del Concilio di Trento, London, 1619. [Bp. *Burnet* says of *Sarpi*, "that it was generally looked upon as the rarest piece of history the world ever saw." It was translated into English by Sir N. Brent, together with his History of the Inquisition (a previous transl., 1655), Lond., 1696; his treatise of Beneficiary Matters, Westm., 1727; his Life, 1651. The Lond. ed. of 1619 was edited by De Dominis. French transl. by *Courayer*, 2 Tom., Amst., 1736.] †*Pallavicini*, Istoria del Conc. di Trento. Rom., 1636, ii. fol., Milan, 1717; Latin by Guttini, Ant., 1673; in French, 3 vols, 1844; translated into German by †*Klitsche*, Augsburg, 1835. *Chemnitii* Examen Concilii Tridentini, Francof., 1707. *Salig*, vollständige Historie des Tridentinischen Conciliums, Halle, 1741, fol. iii. 4. †*Göschl*, *Dr. J. M.*, geschichtliche Darstellung des grossen allgemeinen Concils zu Trient. ii., Regensb., 1840. *Danz*, Gesch. des Trident. Concils nach der Darstellung eines Katholischen Schriftstellers, Jena, 1846. *Marheineke*, System des Katholicismus (see vol. i., § 16). *J. P. Lange*, Die gesetzlich-katholische Kirche, als Sinnbild der freien evang-kathol. Kirche, Heidelberg, 1850. [*Von Wessenberg*, Die grossen Kirchen-versammlungen, 4 Bde., Constanz., 1840 (Bde., 3 and 4), comp. Hefele's Beurtheilung, 1842. *Köllner's* Symbolik, i., Hamb., 1844, on Sarpi, p. 48; on Pallavicino, p. 55. Comp. Ranke's Hist. of Popes, Phil. ed., on Sarpi, p. 437; on Pallavicino, 437; on Trent, 71–74, 108–114, et passim. See the Literature in *Gieseler's* Church Hist. (N. Y. edition), vol. v. § 55. *G. J. Planck*, Anecdota ad Hist. Conc. Trid. pertinentia, 26 Göttingen Programmes, 1791–1818. *J. Mendham*, Memoirs of the Council of Trent, Lond., 1834; and Acta Conc. Trident. a Paleotto, ed. *Mendham*, Lond., 1842, and Suppl., 1840. *J. N. Brischar*, Beurtheilung Sarpi's u. Pallavic., Tüb., 1843, 2 Bde. *Ellies du Pin*, Hist. du Concile de Trente, 2, 4to. Bruxelles, 1721. *Bungener*, Hist. Council Trent, from the French, Lond. 1842, N. Y., 1855. *T. A. Buckley*, Hist. of Council of Trent, Lond., 1832. *Bucholz's* Ferdinand I., 1850. *Rosseeuw St. Hilaire's* Histoire d'Espagne, Tom. viii., 1861, contains new and learned investigations on the Council, in him, as in Ranke, there are new materials. Among the older works, *Heidegger's* Vindication of Fra Paolo, in his Tumulus Concil. Trident., 2, 4to., Zürich, 1690, still deserves to be consulted.—Bp. *Jewel*, Apology and Letters to Scipio on Council of Trent, in his works, and separately published, 1854. On Trent, comp. Christ. Rev., Jan.

1856; Brownson's Quarterly, Oct., 1856. †*Jas. Waterworth*, Essays on Hist. of Council, prefixed to his transl. of its Decrees and Canons. Lond., 1848. †*Chs. Butler*, Historical and Literary Account of Formularies, etc, Lond., 1816, reprinted in his works, vol. iv., 1817.]

Confronted by Protestantism, the Roman Catholics found themselves compelled to examine the state of their own Church. They had to perform a twofold task—viz., *first*, to secure the doctrines which they held from misrepresentation and false inferences, and, *secondly*, to hold fast, with renewed vigor, that which their principles bound them to maintain. The Council of Trent (1545–1593) had therefore to enlighten the Roman Catholic Church on its own position, and solemnly to sanction its system (developed to a great extent by the scholastics of the preceding period) in direct opposition to the demands of the reformers. The declarations of this Council,[1] as well as those set forth in the Roman Catechism, which was based upon the former,[2] are therefore to be regarded as the true symbols of the Romish Church, and every deviating doctrine must in its view renounce all claims to catholicity.

[1] Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini Rom., 1564, 4. In the same year several editions were published at Rome, Venice, Antwerp, Louvain, Cologne, and many others; Lyons, 1580 (with the Index Librorum Prohibitorum). In later times editions have been published by *J. Gallemart*, Col., 1618, 20, Antw., 1644, Lyons, 1712; by *Phil. Chiffelet*, Antw., 1640, and **Jodoc. le Plat.*, Antw., 1779, 4 (Comp. Walch, Bibl. Theol., Tom. i. p. 407, ss.), reprinted by Danz and Streitwolf (comp. Vol. i. p. 31). As regards the history of doctrines and symbolism, the Sessions 4–7, 13, 14, 21–25, are of special importance. [*W. Smets*, Sacros. Conc. Trid. Canones et Decreta, ed. 4, 1854. Canones et Decreta, ex Bullario Roman., ed *Richter*, et Schultze, Lips., 1853. Canons and Decrees, transl. by T. A. Buckley, Lond., 1851: and by *James Waterworth*, Lond., 1848. The Doctrinal Decrees and Canons, transl. by *W. C. Brownlee*, N. Y., 1845.]—The *Professio Fidei Tridentinæ*, based upon the canons of the council, was drawn up A. D. 1564, by order of Pope Pius IV., and no one could obtain either an ecclesiastical office or an academical dignity, etc., without subscribing it. It is in the Bullar. Roman. Tom. ii. p. 127, ss. (and in the form of an appendix in the earlier edition of *Winer*.) Comp. *G. Ch. F. Mohnicke*, Urkundliche Geschichte der sogenannten Professio fidei Trident., etc., Greifswalde, 1822, 8. *Winer*, p. 9. [*Bungener's* Hist. of Council of Trent, ubi supra. *Köllner*, Symbolik, ii. 161–165.]

[2] The Catechismus Romanus was composed (in accordance with a resolution of the Council of Trent, sess. 25), by Archbishop *Leon Marino*, Bishop *Egidius Foscarari*, and *Fr. Fureiro*, a Portuguese scholar, under the superintendence of three cardinals, and published A. D. 1566, by authority of Pope Pius IV. (the Latin version by *Paul Manutius*.) Several editions and translations into the modern languages have been published; *e. g.*, that of Mayence, 1835, 12mo. for general use. In the earlier editions nothing but the

text was given, without any division; in the edition of Cologne, 1572, it was for the first time divided into books and chapters; that of Antwerp, 1574 contained questions and answers. The Catechism consists of four parts: de Symbolo Apostolico, de Sacramentis, de Decalogo, and de Oratione Dominica. Concerning the relation in which the catechism stands to the canons of the Council of Trent, and the inferior importance assigned to it by the Jesuits and other Roman Catholic theologians, see *Winer*, l. c. [The Catechism for the Curates, composed by the decree of the Council of Trent. Faithfully translated, permissu superiorum, Lond., 1687. A translation by T. A. Buckley, Lond., 1852. Comp. *Köllner*, Symbolik, ii. 166–190.]

The catechisms composed by the Jesuit *P. Canisius* (the larger of which appeared, 1554, the smaller, 1566), which acquired greater currency than the Catechismus Romanus, have not received the papal sanction, and on that account cannot be regarded as symbolical books; but they excited more attention, and gave rise to new controversies. Comp. *Joh. Wigand*, Warnung vor dem Catechismus des Dr. Canisii, des grossen Jesuwidders,(!) Jena, 1570, 4. The Confutatio (comp. § 215, note 2,) might also be regarded as a document which sets forth the principles of Romanism, in opposition to Protestantism; but it was not formally sanctioned by the Church.

[Among the secondary sources are the *Roman Missal*, and the *Breviary*. See *Köllner*, ii. 190, *sq.* The Council of Trent ordered the revision of the Missal, published in 1570; again in 1604, which is followed in all the reprints. On the Breviarium, see Köcher Bibl. Symbol. i. 755, *sq.*; it is so called, because in it the previous offices were abbreviated (under Gregory VII). The Council of Trent ordered a revision; printed 1568, and often. English translation of Missal, Lond. *Robertson*, Rom. Liturgy, Edb., 1792. Geo. Lewis, The Bible, Missal and Breviary, 2 vols., Edinb., 1853, contains the first complete English transl. of the Liturgy. Besides the Catechism of Canisius, that of *Bellarmine*, prepared by direction of Clement VIII., 1603, and of *Bossuet*, for the diocese of Meaux, 1687, have had much authority].

§ 227.

THE THEOLOGIANS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

[Kuhn, Kathol. Dogmatik, 2te., Aufl. 1 (1859) s. 463–519. *Hugo Laemmer*, Die vortridentinisch-katholische, Theologie. Aus den Quellen, Berl., 1858. *Gieseler*, v., § 63.]

Among the theologians who defended the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, during the age of the Reformation,[1] along with *Eck*, *Faber*, *Cochlæus*, and others, *Desiderius Erasmus* occupied the most prominent place, though he did not transmit to posterity a system of dogmatic theology.[2] To this period also belongs *Albert Pighius*,[3] whom Calvin opposed. After the Council of Trent, the members of the Order of Jesus, in particular,[4] made the defence of modern Romanism (both theoretically and practically) the task of their lives. The most conspicuous doctrinal and polemical writer among them was *Robert Bellarmine*;[5] while *Dionysius Petavius*, endeavored to prove historically the antiquity of the catholic faith.[6] The following writers on dogmatic theology (and ethics), belonged to that religious society; *Peter Canisius*,[7] *Alphonse Salmeron*,

John Maldonat,[9] *Francis Suarez*,[10] *Gabriel Vasquez*,[11] *Francis Coster*,[12] *Martin Becanus*,[13] and others. Among the opponents of the Jesuits and their scholastic method, *Melchor Canus*, a Dominican monk was the most distinguished.[14] *Jacques Bénigne Bossuet*, the acute and clever Bishop of Meaux, by idealising Catholicism as much as was possible, endeavored to render it more agreeable to Protestants, while, on the other hand, he showed the changes which Protestant doctrines had undergone within a short space of time.[15]

[1] On *Thomas Cajetan* (who wrote a commentary on Thomas Aquinas), *Eck*, *Faber*, *Cochlæus*, *Wimpina*, *Ambrose Catharinus*, and others; see the works on the history of the Reformation, and *Bouginé*, Literaturgeschichte, ii. p. 70, ss., and *Laemmer*, l. c. [On *Cajetan*, see *Gieseler*, v., § 63. Opera Omnia, 5, fol., Lugd., 1639. His translation of the Bible was literal. For his liberal views he was assailed by the Dominican Catharinus. *C. F. Jäger*, Cajetan's Kampf gegen die lutherische Lehrreform, in Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol., 1858.] Concerning *George Wicel*, who returned to the Romish Church (he was born A. D. 1501, and died 1573, he wrote: Via Regia, Helmst., 1650, De sacris nostri Temporis Controversiis, ibid., 1659), comp. **Neander*, de Georgio Vicelio., Berol., 1839, 4, and by the same: das Eine und Mannigfache des christlichen Lebens, Berlin, 1840, p. 167, ss. [*Gieseler*, iv., § 51, note 6.]

[2] *Erasmus* died at Basle, A. D. 1536. The most important of his controversial writings, in which he opposed Luther's notions concerning the will of man, are mentioned in the special history of doctrines. Comp. **Ad. Müller*, Leben des Erasmus von Rotterdam, Hamb., 1828, 8. [*Jortin's* Life of E., 2, 4to., 1758–60; *Knight's* Life, Cambr., 1760; Hess, 2, Zürich, 1770; *Chs. Butler*, Lond., 1825. Der theol. Standpunkt des Erasm., by *Kerker*, in Theol. Quartalschrift, 1859, s. 531–567. Articles on Erasmus in Eclectic (Lond.), Sept., 1854; Christ. Examiner (by *C. T. Brooks*), vol. 49; Southern Rev., vol. 3; Christ. Rev. (by *W. C. Wilkinson*), April, 1858. See also *Nisard*, Etudes sur la Renaissance, 1855.]

[3] The family name of Pighius was Von Campen; he died as provost of the church of St. John at Utrecht, Dec., 1542. Works: De Hierarchia Ecclesiast., and De libero Hominis Arbitrio, et div. Gratia, libri x., Cola., 1542. See *Bayle*, Diction., and *Schweizer's* Centraldogmen, i. 180. [Calvin's defence against this work of Pighius is entitled Defensio sanæ et orthodoxæ Doctrinæ de Servitute et Liberatione humani Arbitrii advers. Calumnias Alb. Pighii Campensis, Genev., 1545; it is published in his Tractatus.]

[4] On the foundation of this order by *Ignatius Loyola*, (1534–40), see the works on ecclesiastical history. Respecting the doctrinal views of the Jesuits (Mariolatry) see Baumgarten Crusius, Compendium der Dogmengesch. i. pp. 394, 395. [*Ranke*, Hist. Popes (Phil.) 56–71, 77–81, et passim. App. 520. The literature in *Gieseler*, v., § 54. Abbé *Guettée*, Hist. des Jesuites, Paris, 2 vols., 1859.]

[5] "*As regards controversies, he was the best writer of his age.*"—Bayle.

Bellarmine was born A. D. 1542, at Monte-Pulciano, in Tuscany, entered the order of the Jesuits, 1560, was appointed cardinal, 1599, archbishop Capua, 1602, and died 1621. He wrote: Disputationes de Controversiis Fidei adv. hujus Temporis Hæreticos, Ingolst., 1581, 82, ii. f. P. iii. 1592, fol., Venet., 1596, iii. fol. This work was opposed not only by Protestants, but also by some Roman Catholics. See *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. nach der Reformation, iv. p. 260, ss. The best Protestant work written against Bellarmine was that of *Scherzer*, *J. A.* (he died 1683), Antibellarminus, Lips., 1681, 4. [In 1607 Bellarmine published a volume of corrections of the previous editions of his work, under the title Recognitio Librorum, incorporated in the editions of 1615, 1620, Paris, 1635; Prague, 1721; reprinted, Rome, 4, 4to., 1832–40, with an Appendix, Monument. Eccles. The best edition is that of 1620; that of Venice, 1721–27, omits several of B.'s works. His Notes of the Church, refuted by Anglican writers, several editions; comp. *Kuhn*, ubi supra, 490.]

[6] *Petavius*, was born at Orleans, A. D. 1583, and died at Paris, 1652. He wrote Opus de Theologicis Dogmatibus. Par., 1644–50, iv., Antw., 1700, vi.; *Heinrich*, p. 377, ss. His method was adopted by *Ludw. Thomassin*, in his Dogmata Theologica, 1680–84. See *Heinrich*, p. 582. [Petavius was Prof. of theology at Paris from 1621. Muratori represents him as the reviver of dogmatic theology. The Antwerp (really Amsterdam) edition of 1700, in 6 Tom., was edited by *Johannes Clericus*, under the pseudonym of Theophilus Alettinus, who in his preface defends him against *Sandius* and *Bullus*, in respect to the Trinity, etc. The edition of *Zacharia*, Venice, 1757, is the best. A new edition is in progress at Rome, vol. i., 1858, ed. by *Passaglia* and *Schrader*. He also wrote De Doctrina Temporum, 3 fol., Antw., 1705. *Gibbon* says of Petav. (Decline and Fall, chap. xlvii. note 1: "His Dogm. Theolog. is a work of incredible labor and compass, the volumes which relate solely to the Incarnation (2, fol.) are divided into xvi. books....The Jesuit's learning is copious and correct; his Latinity is pure, his method clear, his argument profound and well connected; but he is the slave of the fathers, the scourge of heretics, and the enemy of truth and candor as often as they are inimical to the Catholic cause." Comp. also *Kuhn*, Dogmatik, i. 505, *sq.*, who represents him as introducing a new method, neither scholastic nor speculative, but positive, in the treatment of theology. He was followed by *Thomasson*, the Oratorian, 3 Tom., Paris, 1680–4; *Fluardentius*, Tractatus Theol., Paris, 1692–4; *Du Hamel*, Theologia Speculatrix, Paris, 1691; *Natalis Alexander* (the church historian), Theolog. Dogmat., Paris, 1693.—Most of the R. C. divines, till the middle of the 18th century, adhered to the scholastic (Thomist) method; a few followed Scotus. The Scotists were *Frassen*, Scotus Academicus, Paris, 1672; and *L'Herminier*, Summa Theol. Scholast., Paris, 1771. *Gonet*, Clypeus Theol. Thomist.; Burdigal, 1659, was a Thomist; as were also *Contenson*, Theologia Mentis et Cordis, Colon., 1722; *Witasse*, Tract Theol., Paris, 1722; *Boucat*, Theol. Patrum., Paris, 1718; *Billuart*, Cursus theol. juxta Mentem S. Thom., 1745. Others, somewhat later,—*Tournely*, Prælect. Theol. Venet., 1739; *Gotti*, Theol. Scholast. dogm., Venet., 1750;

Berti, De Theol. Discipl., Venet., 1776; *Hubert*, Theol. Dogm. et Moral., Vindel., 1751. *Kuhn*, ubi supra.]

[7] The original name of *Canisius* was *de Hondt;* he was born A. D. 1511, and died 1597. He was the author of a Summa Doctrinæ Christianæ (Institutiones Christianæ.) Par., 1628, f., and of the two catechisms mentioned § 226.

[8] *Salmeron* was born at Toledo, and died A. D. 1585. His works were published at Madrid, 1597–1602. Cologne, 1612, xvi. fol.

[9] *Maldonatus* was born A. D. 1534, taught in the universities of Salamanca and Paris, and died 1583. His works appeared at Paris, 1643, 77, iii. fol. *Heinrich*, p. 302, ss. *Schröckh*, iv. p. 83. [He opposed the Jesuit view of the Immaculate Conception of Mary as necessary to the faith. He was called to Rome by Gregory XIII. to superintend the publication of the Septuagint.]

[10] *Suarez* died A. D. 1617, at Lisbon. He wrote: Commentatio in Thomæ Summam., Mogunt., 1619–29, xix. fol.

[11] *Vasquez* died A. D. 1604, at Alcala. He wrote: Commentarii in Thomam. Ingolstad., 1606. Ven., 1608. Antw., 1621.

[12] *Coster* was professor of theology and philosophy in the university of Cologne, provincial of his order in the Rhine provinces, and died A. D. 1619. He wrote: Enchridion præcipuarum Controvers. in Religione; Meditationes. —*Schröckh*, iv. p. 280.

[13] *Becan* was successively professor in the universities of Würzburg, Mayence, and Vienna, and died 1624, as confessor to the Emperor Ferdinand II.; he had before taught in Würzburg, Mayence and Vienna.—He wrote: Summa Theol.—Manuale Controversiarum hujus Temporis.—Opp. Mogunt., 1639, 1640, ii. f.

[14] *Canus* was a native of Taracon, [born 1523], and died A. D. 1560, as the provincial of his order in Castile. He wrote: Locorum Theol. libr. xii. Salam., 1563, f. Padua, 1714, 4, Venet., 1759, 4, and Vienna, 1764, (edited by *Hyacinth Serry.*) Comp. *Heinrich*, p. 298, ss. *Schröckh*, iv. p. 66, ss. [See *Kuhn*, ubi supra, p. 486, and *Laemmer*.]

[15] *Bossuet* was born at Dijon, A. D. 1627, was appointed bishop of Meaux, 1681, and died 1704. Among his works were: Exposition de la Doctrine de l'église Catholique, 1671, edited by *Fleury*, Antw., 1678, 12.—Histoire des Variations des églises Protestantes, Par. (and Amst.), 1688, ii. 8. He was opposed by: *Basnage* (Hist. de la Rel. des églises Réformées, Rot., 1721), and *Pfaff* (Disputatt. Anti-Bossuet. Tub., 1720,) to which Bossuet replied, Defense, etc., Paris, 1701. Several Roman Catholics also pronounced against Bossuet's interpretation of their doctrines, *e. g. Maimbourg*, the Jesuit. See *Schröckh*, vii. p. 280, ss. Comp. *C. Schmidt*, in Herzog's Realencycl. ii. 317, *sq.* [Œuvres, 20, 4to., Paris, 1743–1753. *Deprés'* edition, 27 vols., not complete. *Versailles* ed. by *Bausset*, 46 vols. Œuvres complètes de B., 59 vols., Paris, 1825; 12 vols., 1836. An English translation of his Exposition, by *W[alter] M[ontague]*, Paris, 1672; another London. Hist. of Variations, transl., 2 vols., Dubl., 1836, 1845. On the Exposition, see Nouv. de la Républ. de Lettres, x. 931, 1252. Histoire de Bossuet par M. le Cardinal *de Bausset*, nouv. ed. Paris, 8, 1855. Mémoires et

Journ. sur la Vie et les Ouvrages de Bossuet (from manuscripts), par l'Abbé *Guettée*, 2, Paris, 1856, who also publ. in 1854, Essai sur l'Ouvrage de B. "Avertissement sur les Réflex. morales" (of Quesnel), vindicating it as Bossuet's work, and showing that B. opposed the Jesuits. *A. Floquet*, Etudes sur Bossuet, vol. i. 1855. See also *Bouillier*, Hist. de la Philos. Cartésienne, Tom. ii. *A. Caillot*, Vie de Bossuet, Paris, 1836.]

§ 228.

JANSENISM.

**Reuchlin*, Geschichte von Port-Royal, der Kampf des reformirten und jesuitischen Katholicismus unter Ludwig XIII. XIV., 2 vols., Hamb., 1839–1844. See also the article in *Herzog*. [*Sainte-Beuve*, Hist. de Port-Royal, 4 vols., Paris, 1840–1858. *Ch. Beard*, Port-Royal, 2 vols., Lond., 1860. *Schimmelpenninck*, Memoirs of Port-Royal, Lond., 1855. On *Reuchlin's* work, see Sir *Jas. Stephen*, Essays, vol. i. *C. A. Wilkens*, Port-Royal, oder der Jansenismus in Frankreich, in Zeitschrift f. d. Wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1859. Meth. Quarterly, N. Y., 1855. Older Histories of Port Royal, by *Fontaine*, 2 vols., 1798; *Racius*, 2 vols., 1764; *Quesnel*, La Paix de Charles IX., 2 vols., 1701.—*Works on the Jansenists*; *Leydecker*, Hist. Jans. Traj. ad Rhenum, 1695. (*Gerberon*), Hist. Générale de Jans., Rom., 3 vols., 1711. *Dom. de Colonia*, Diction. de Livres Jansen., 4 vols., Lyons, 1752. Histories by *Tregelles*, 1851; *Bellegrade*, 1851 (see Christ. Rembr., Jan., 1852); and particularly *J. M. Neale*, Hist. of the so-called Jansenist Church in Holland, Lond., 1857; comp. Dublin Rev., 1858. —The True Idea of Jansenism, both Historick and Dogmatick, by *T[heophilus] G[ale]*, Lond., 1699.—Articles in Irish Eccles. Journal, 1852; Bibl. Repos., 1847; Church Rev., Jan., 1858; Dublin Rev., 1854 (tracing the French revolution to Jansenism; and the same view in Brownson's Quarterly); Princeton Rev., Jan., 1856; Christ. Rev., April, 1856; Am. Theol. Rev. (*L. Whiting*), 1860; Kitto's Journal of Sacred Lit., vol. vii.—Specimen Hist. Theol. exhibens Historiam Eccl. Ultraject. Rom. Cath., male Jansenisticæ dictæ, scripsit *J. A. Gerth van Wijk*, Traj. ad Rhen., 1859.]

In opposition to the Jesuitic and Pelagian dogmatic theology and ethics, *Jansenism* took its rise, following some earlier precedents,[1] and spread from the Netherlands into France, gaining a powerful centre and support in the Congregation of Port-Royal.[2] On the one hand (in reference to the doctrine of election, etc.) the Jansenists manifested a leaning towards Protestantism, and thus maintained the Protestant principle about faith within the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church; on the other (as regards the sacraments and the doctrine about the Church), they retained the views of the latter. In both respects their views were in accordance with the earlier Augustinianism, which they were desirous of restoring in all its purity.[3] The theologians of Port-Royal, such as *Antoine Arnauld*,[4] *Peter Nicole*,[5] and others, exerted greater influence upon the belief of their contemporaries, by their practical and ascetic writings, or scientific works of a more general character, than by strictly dogmatic works The profound *Pascal*, in particular, ad-

vanced the good cause, both by his opposition to the casuistry of the Jesuits, and by his ingenious defence of Christianity.[6] *Paschasius Quesnel*, a priest of the Oratory, propagated Jansenistic principles, together with the New Testament, among the people, and thus exposed the Jansenists to new persecutions, and called forth new controversies.[7]

[1] On the earlier manifestation of the Augustinian tendency in the Catholic Church, see *Ranke*, History of the Popes (Philad.) p. 73, and the special history of doctrines.—Concerning the doctrines of *M. Bajus* at Louvain, and the controversy to which they gave rise, respecting *Lewis Molina* and others, see ibidem. [See *Niedner*, Kirchengesch., 649, 706–710. Mich. *Baji* Opera, Colon, 1696. *Du Chesne*, Hist. du Bajanisme, Douay, 1791. *Molina*, Liberi Arbitrii cum Gratiæ Donis....Concordia, Lisb., 1588, Antw., 1595.—Pius V. condemned in a mild form, 79 theses from *Baius*, in 1567, in the Bull *Ex omnibus Afflictionibus*. See *Gieseler*, s. § 59.]

[2] *Cornelius Jansen* was born A. D. 1585, and died 1638, as bishop of Ypern. His principal work was edited after his death: Augustinus seu Doctrina S. Augustini de humanæ Naturæ Sanitate, Ægritudine, Medicina adversus Pelagianos et Massilienses, Low, 1640, iii. f. Concerning the external history of Jansenism (the bull *In Eminenti* issued by Pope Urban VIII., A. D. 1642), as well as of *Jean du Vergier*, abbot of St. Cyran, and Port-Royal des Champs, compare the works of *Reuchlin*, *Neale*, etc., and the works on ecclesiastical history in general; as regards the scientific importance of the Society of Port-Royal, in its bearing upon France, see the works on the history of literature, especially: *Sainte Beuve*, Port-Royal, 4 vols., Paris, 1840–58. [Histoire des cinq Propositions de Jansen, Liège, 1699, 2 vols., (by *Dumas*.)]

[3] Comp. Vol. i., § 84, 114. Jansenism may be called Protestantism within the Roman Catholic Church, so far as Jesuitism, which is its antithesis, represents modern Catholicism. But we ought to bear in mind, that this can be said only in reference to the doctrines of grace and of good works. As regards the sacraments (and especially the Lord's Supper), the Jansenists have strictly retained the views of the Roman Catholic Church, and are quite as decidedly opposed to the Protestant doctrines as the Council of Trent, or the Jesuits.

[4] *Arnauld* was born A. D. 1612, and died 1694. His complete works appeared after his death, Lausanne, 1680, 4. Comp. *Reuchlin*, p. 132, ss. Kirchenhistorisches Archiv., 1824, p. 101, ss. [The chief works of *Arnauld*, De la fréquente Communion, 1643; La Theologie Morale des Jesuites, 1643; Apologie de Jansen, 1644; Œuvres, 48, 4to. He wrote against the Protestants (Jurieu and Aubertin), the Jesuits (Maimbourg, Annat), and the philosophers (Descartes and Malebranche). Causa Arnaldina, 2 vols., Leod. Eb., 1699. *Vavin*, La Verité sur Arnauld, 2 vols., Paris, 1847.]

[5] *Nicole*, was born A. D. 1625, and died 1695. He opposed the Jesuits as as well as the Protestants. Kirchen. Archiv. l. c. p. 121, ss. [Nicole and Jansenists, Princeton Rev., Jan., 1856. His essays have a high reputation; 25 vols., Paris, 1733, *sq.*]

[6] *Pascal* was born A. D. 1623, at Clermont in Auvergne, and died 1662. He wrote: Les Provinciales (Lettres écrites par Louis Montalte à un Provincial de ses amis.) Col., 1657.—Pensées sur la Religion, 1669. They were translated into German by *K. A. Blech*, with a preface by Neander, Berlin, 1840. Œuvres, Paris, 1816. Comp. the biography composed by his sister (Mad. Périer), and prefixed to his Pensées; *Theremin* (Adalberts Bekenntniss, Berlin, 1831), p. 222, ss. *J. Rust*, de Blasio Pascale, Erlang., 1833, 4, and **Reuchlin*, Pascals Leben und der Geist seiner Schriften, Stuttg., 1840. [Pascals Pensées, first published by Périer, imperfect, and mutilated; also by Condorcet, 1776; Voltaire, 1778; revised by *Faugères*, after the original, 2 vols., 1844, and *Havet*, 1852, and Astié, 2 vols., Lausanne, 1857. Des Pensées de Pascal, par V. Cousin, 1843 (comp. Rev. de deux Mondes, Nov. 15, 1853, article by Planche, reviewing the whole controversy, and Villemain's Discours., 1855). *A. Vinet*, Etudes sur Blaise Pascal, Paris, 1848. *Neander*, geschichtliche Bedeutung d. Pensées in his wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen. Abbé *Maynard*, Les Provinciales et leur Refutation, 2 vols., Paris, 1851; comp. Christ. Remembr., July, 1852, a vindication of Pascal.—An English transl. of the Provincial Letters, 2d ed., 1658, Lond.; also, 1816. Thoughts, newly transl. ed. by Bickersteth, 1833. McCrie's transl. of Letters, Edinb. Thoughts and Letters, etc., 3 vols., Lond., 1847–50 by *Geo. Pearce*, New York, 2 vols., 1858. Thoughts, transl. by *O. W. Wight*, and Priv. Letters; 2 vols., New York, 1861. Articles on Pascal; Kitto's *Journal*, vol. 3; Eclectic (Lond.), Nov., 1852; Princeton Rev., Jan., 1854; *Rogers*, in his Miscellanies; North American (*Bowen*) vol. 60; Neander on Pascal, transl. in Kitto, vol. 3; on Recent Editions and Transl., Meth. Quarterly, xii.]

[7] *Quesnel* died A. D. 1719. He published Le Nouveau Testament en français avec de reflexions morales, etc., Par., 1687. On the controversies respecting the constitution of the Church, see the works on ecclesiastical history. [The 101 Propositions of *Quesnel*, condemned, see in Church Review, Jan., 1858. The New Test. of Quesnel, with Moral Reflections, Lond., 4 vols., 1719–25: his Four Gospels, 2 vols. Balt., 1790: republ., edited by bp. Wilson in 3 vols.; Philadelphia ed., 2 vols., 1855. Acta Publica Constitutionis Unigenitus, ed. *Pfaff*, Tüb., 1721; Collectio Nova Actorum, ed. Dubois, 1725; Anecdotes, on Mém. secretes de la Const. Unig., 3 vols., Utrecht, 1732.]

§ 229.

THE MYSTICISM OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Hamberger, Stimmen aus dem Heiligthum d. Christl. Mystik u. Theosophie. Stuttg. 1857. [*Vaughan, loc. cit.*]

Nothwithstanding all the efforts made by Roman Catholics to obtain the ascendency in science, art, and politics (an attempt in which the Jesuits displayed the greatest activity), they never entirely lost that spiritual tendency which characterized the orthodox

mystics of the middle ages. The most distinguished representatives of this tendency, were the new saints *Charles Borromeo*,[1] *Francis of Sales*,[2] and others, together with Cardinal *John Bona*.[3] Nevertheless, mysticism here again showed a tendency to pantheism, as is evident in the case of the German mystic, *Angelus Silesius*.[4]—The mystic quietism of *Michael Molinos*,[5] a Spanish secular priest, formed a striking contrast to the intriguing worldliness of the Jesuits, and gave rise to the *Quietist* controversy in France.[6] None but men of as pure a character as *Fénélon*,[7] whose life was one of constant communion with God, could hold such a doctrine in its ideal aspect, without exposing themselves to the danger of fanaticism, the bare possibility of which affrighted men of sober intellect, such as *Bossuet*.[8]

[1] *Borromeo* was born A. D. 1538, at Arona, and died 1584, as archbishop of Milan. He was canonised, 1610. Compare: **Sailer*, der heil. Karl Borromeus, Augsb., 1823. For his writings, which are chiefly ascetical, see ibid. p. 146, and 225, ss. (where extracts from his homilies are given.) [*Godeau*, La Vie de Chs. Borrom., Paris, 1747. *Giussano*, Leben des B. (from Italian), by Klitsche, 3 vols., Augsb., 1836. *Dieringer*, der heil. Borrom. d. Kirchen- Verbess. seiner Zeit. Köln., 1846.]

[2] *Francis of Sales* was born A. D. 1567, in Savoy, and died 1622, as bishop (in partibus) of Geneva. He was canonised 1665.—A new edition of his works appeared, Paris, 1834, in sixteen vols.—Introduction à la vie dévote. A memoir of his life was published by *Marsollier*, Paris, 1747, ii. 8. Comp. *Sailer*, Briefe aus allen Jahrhunderten, Vol. iii. p. 127, ss. [*Baudry*, Supplement aux Œuvres de Franç. de Sales, Lyon, 1836. *Reusing* Leben d. heil. Fr. v. Sales, Paderb., 1818. *L. Clarus*, Leben von Fr. v. Sales, ii. Schaffh., 1860. An Introduction to a Devout Life, translated by *W. Nicholls*, Lond., 1701. Philotheca, or an Introduction to a Devout Life, Dubl., 1844.]

[3] *Cardinal Bona* was born A. D. 1609, at Mondori, in Piedmont, entered the order of the Benedictines, was made cardinal, 1669, and died 1674.—He wrote: Via Compendii ad Deum. Col., 1671, 12.—Manuductio ad Cœlum. Par., 1664, 12. His works appeared Par. (Antw.), 1677, and Antw., 1739, fol. [Bona's Guide to Eternity, transl. by Sir *R. L'Estrange*, 6th ed., Lond., 1712; Moral Essay on Friendship, Lond., 1702.]

[4] His proper name was *Scheffler*,* he was born A. D. 1624, at Breslau, renounced Protestantism for the Roman Catholic Church, 1653, and died 1677, in the monastery of the Jesuits at Breslau. He wrote: Heilige Seelenlust—Cherubinischer Wandersmann, etc. Extracts from his works are given by *Wackernagel*, Deutsches Lesebuch, ii. col. 427, ss.—*Varnhagen von Ense*, Denkwürdigkeiten und vermischte Schriften, 1837, i. p. 307, ss. **Goschel*, in the Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik, 1834, N°. 41, ss.

* *Schrader* objects to the identity of *Silesius* and *Scheffler*, in his work, Angelus Silesius in seiner Mystik, Halle, 1853, 4to., but on insufficient grounds.

Wittmann, Angelus Silesius, als Convertit, Myst. Dichter, und Polemiker, Augsb., 1842. *Kahlert*, Angelus Silesius, Bresl., 1853. [Comp. *Schuster*, in Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theologie, 1857. Westminst. Rev., Oct., 1853.]

[6] *Molinos* died A. D. 1696, after several years' imprisonment in Rome. On the question whether he stood in connection with the Alombrados, see *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Compend. d. Dogm. Gesch. i. p. 407. He composed a Guida spirituale, Rom., 1675. (It was translated into Latin by *A. H. Francke*, Lips., 1687, 12. *C. E. Scharling*, Michael de Molinos (from the Danish) [in Niedner's Zeitschrift, 1854], Gotha, 1855. [Recueil de diverses Pièces concernant le Quietisme; on Molinos, ses sentiments, etc., Amst., 1688. Molinos' Spiritual Guide, transl., Lond., 1688. Lettres écrits de Rome touchant l'affaire de Molin. Amst., 1696. See Notes and Queries, June, 1855, p. 424, in Three Letters on Italy, 1687, by Burnet? Account of English Mystical works, Notes and Queries, Dec. 20, 1856 (*Willis*, *Tryon*, *Bromley*, etc.)]—Other Spanish mystics prior to his time were: *Therese a Jesu* (who died A. D. 1582) and *Johannes a Cruce* (who died A. D. 1591, and was canonised 1726). *Lope de Vega*, died 1635. Comp. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, l. c. p. 410. *Hamberger*, 189.

[6] The controversy was called forth by *Antoinette Marie Bouvières de la Mothe-Guyon* (who died A. D. 1717); see her autobiography, Col., 1720, iii. and the account of her life given by her confessor, *François la Combe*. Concerning the controversy itself, see the works on ecclesiastical history, and the biography of Fénélon mentioned in the following note. [Der Quietismus in Frankreich, *Ruckgaber*, in Theol. Quartalschrift, 1856, 2, 4. *Vaughan*, *Helfferich*, *Noack*, in their works on Mysticism. Life of Madam Guyon, by Prof. *T. C. Upham*, 2 vols., 1824; comp. Brit. Qu. Rev., May, 1853.—The complete works of Madame Guion form 49 volumes. The Life of Lady Guion, written by herself in French, abridged, Bristol, 1772.—Life by *T. Digby Brookes*, Lond., 1806. Poems transl. by *W. Cowper*, 1801.]

[7] *Fénélon* was born A. D. 1651, and died 1715, as bishop of Cambray. He wrote: Explication des maximes des Saints sur la vie intérieure, Par., 1697, Amst., 1698, 12. Œuvres Spirituelles, Amst., 1725, v. 12. They were translated into German by *Claudius*, Hamb., 1823, iii. A very full memoir of his life (in which an account of the whole controversy is given) is contained in the work of **Bausset*, Histoire de J. B. Bossuet, 4 Vols, Vers., 1814, and *Herder*, Adrastea (Werke zur Philosophie, Vol. ix. p. 43). See *Lechler*, in Herzog's Realencyclop., and comp. § 228, note 7. [*Bonnel*, De la Controverse de Bossuet et Fénélon, Paris, 1850. *Fénélon*, Œuvres, 10 vols., Par., 1851. Transl. of Directions for Holy Life, 1747; Demonstration of Being of of God, 1715; Pastoral Letter concerning Love of God, 1715; Part of his Spiritual Works, by *R. Houghton*, 2 vols., Dubl., 1771; De Bausset's Life of F. transl. by *W. Mudford*, 2 vols., Lond., 1810. Fénélon's Life by *Ch. Butler*, 1810. Selections from F.'s Writings, with a Memoir, by Mrs. *Follen*, Bost., 1851. Spiritual Progress, or Instructions in the Divine Life, from the French of Fénélon and Madame Guyon, ed. *T. W. Metcalf*, Bost., 1854.]

[8] See his Relation sur le Quiétisme, 1693.

On the different features which the mysticism of the Roman Catholic Church presents ("areopagitic, ascetic, speculative, and truly religious mysticism"), see *Baumgarten-Crusius*, i. p. 409.

§ 230.

LIBERAL TENDENCIES IN CRITICISM AND SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. TRANSITION TO THE FOLLOWING PERIOD.

Though a system of liberal criticism in general was restrained by the very principle of Romanism, yet in respect to *biblical* literature the critical spirit was able to develop itself more freely among Roman Catholics than among Protestants. Thus *Richard Simon* laid the foundation of biblical criticism,[1] and also contributed, by his doctrinal writings, to prepare the way for that new state of things which was to grow out of the conflicts of the most heterogeneous elements. About the same time *John Baptist du Hamel*,[2] and *Natalis Alexander*,[3] were distinguished as theologians of a more liberal tendency, who endeavoured to throw off the yoke of scholasticism. [Comp. § 228, Note 6.]

[1] *Simon* was born A. D. 1638, and died 1712. His work is entitled: Histoire Critique du Vieux Test. Rot., 1685, 4, du N. T., 1689.

[2] *Du Hamel* was born A. D. 1624, officiated as priest of the Oratory, and died 1706. He wrote: Theol. Speculativa et Practica, Par., 1691. *Heinrich*, p. 382. *Schröckh*, vii. p. 208.

Noel Alexander was born A. D. 1639, and died 1724; he belonged to the order of the Dominicans, and was a learned monk. [He was condemned for his Gallicanism by Pope Innocent XI., 1684.] Besides his famous Hist. Eccles., best ed. 20, 4to., by Romaglia and Mansi, 1785–90; he wrote: Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis, Par., 1693, X. 8, 1699, 1703. Dissertationes Historico-ecclesiasticæ, ii. fol. *Heinrich*, p. 384. *Schröckh*, l. c.

IV.—THE GREEK CHURCH.

§ 231.

While the very foundations of the Roman Catholic Church were shaken by the Reformation, which, nevertheless, exerted, in some respects, a reviving and regenerating influence upon it, the Greek Church presented the mournful aspect of a ruin in the midst of surrounding Mohammedan nations. It came into contact with Protestantism, but only externally, and for a very short time.[1] *Cyrillus Lucaris*, patriarch of Constantinople, lost his life (A.D. 1638) in consequence of betraying a leaning toward Calvinism.[2] Soon after

(A D. 1642), *Petrus Mogilas*, metropolitan of Kiew, together with some other Greek theologians, drew up a confession of faith for the Russians, which met with the approbation of the patriarchs of the East, and received (1672) the sanction of the Synod of Jerusalem. Though *Leo Allatius* (1669), endeavoured to prove the agreement between the doctrines of the Greek and the Roman Churches, the former continued to maintain its independence.[4]

[1] A. D. 1559 Melancthon transmitted a Greek translation of the Confessio Augustana to the patriarch Joseph II., but without results. Nor did the negotiations between the patriarch Jeremias II. (1574) on the one hand, and Jac. Andreä, and the theologians of Tübingen on the other, lead to any more favorable result. The correspondence to which they gave rise was broken off A. D., 1581; see *Schnurrer*, De Actis inter Tub. Theoll. et Patriarchas Const. (Oratt. Acad. ed. Paulus, Tub., 1828.)

[2] (*Λεύκαρις.*) *Ἀνατολικὴ ὁμολογία τῆς χριστιανικῆς πίστεως*, lat. Genev., 1629, Greek, 1633, Latin and Greek, 1645. It is given by *Aymon*, Monumens Authentiques de la Rel. des Grecs, etc. à la Haye, 1708, 4; and by *Kimmel*, Libri Symbol. Eccl. Orient, p. 24, *sq.* See his Prolegomena, p. xxiii. [On *Cyril Lucar*, see *Neale's* Holy Eastern Church, 4 vols., 1848–50. British Magazine, Sept., 1842, Dec., 1843, Jan. and June, 1844. *Mohnike*, in Studien u. Kritiken, 1832. *A. Twesten*, in Deutsche Zeitschrift, Sept. and Oct., 1850. Edinburgh Rev., April, 1858. Spectateur de l'Orient, 1855. *Κύριλλος Λούκαρις, ὁ οἰκομενικὸς πατριάρχης.* — *Ὑπο Μάρκου Ῥεντέρη*, Athens, 1859. Comp. Gersdorf's Repert., Sept., 1860. Princeton Review, vol. 5.]

[3] *Ἔκθεσις τῆς τῶν Ῥωσῶν πίστεως*, 1642; afterwards under the title: *Ὀρθόδοξος ὁμολογία τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνατολικῆς. Kimmel*, p. 45, and Prolegomena p. l. Comp. Synodus Hierosolymitana advers. Calvinistas anno MDCLXXII. sub Patriarcha Hierosolymorum celebrata, in *Kimmel*, p. 325, *sq.*, and Prolegomena, p. lxxv. [*Hase*, Glaubenszeugnisse der griechischen Kirche: in Appendix to 5th ed. of his Dogmatik, 1860. *Macaire*, Theologie dogm. orthodoxe, traduite par un Russe. 2 vols., Paris, 1860. *R. W. Blackmore*, Doctrine of the Russian Church, translated, Lond. *A. N. Monravieff*, Hist. of the Church of Russia, transl. by *Blackmore*. *John Covel*, Account of the Greek Church, Lond. 1722. Antiquit. Eccl. Orient., Lond. 1682, (see Notes and Queries, x., p. 60.) The Greek Church in Russia, its Rites, Doctrines, etc., by *John G. King*, 4to., Lond. 1772. The Orthodox Doctrine of Apost. Eastern Chh., transl., *G. Petassaco*, Lond. 1858. *W. Beveridge*, Synodikon, sive Pandectae Canonum, etc., ab Eccl. Græca recept., 2 vols., Oxon. 1672–82. *H. J. Schmitt*, Krit. Gesch. d. neu-griech und Russ. Kirche, 1850 (4). *Gass* in Herzog's Realencycl. *Palmer* on the Church, i., 176–206, and in his Dissertations. *Pitzipios*, L' Eglise Orientale. Articles in New York Rev., Oct., 1853; Christ. Remembrancer, July, 1853; Church of Eng. Quarterly, July, 1854; Christ. Rev., 1855; Christ. Examiner, 1855; Bibliotheca Sacra, (*Manning*), 1858;

Encyclop Britan. (8th ed.), by *Hetherington*. Dean *Waddington*, Hist. of Greek Church, new ed., 1854. *Stanley*, Lect. on East. Church, Lond., 1861.]

V.—MINOR RELIGIOUS PARTIES (SECTS).

§ 232.

Schlüsselburg. Conrad, Catalogus hæreticorum Francoff., 1696. ss. xiii. 8. *Erbkam*, Gesch. d. Protest. Secten im Zeitalter der Reformation, Hamb. 1848.

While the reform was pursuing its great work, various tendencies also manifested themselves in opposition to the existing Catholic Church, which we may in part regard as a continuation of an earlier unchurchly spirit of antagonism, and partly as the one-sided negative efforts of a narrow-minded criticism. Protestants could not make common cause with them without becoming disintegrated. On that account, Anabaptism and Unitarianism, which had already been rejected by the Catholic Church (though under different forms), met with an equally decisive opposition from Lutherans and Calvinists, and were, accordingly, stigmatized as sects. And, again, at a later period, several sects made their appearance, of which only a few, *e. g.* the Society of Friends, have prolonged their existence to the present time. On the other hand, the rigid dogmatism of the Protestant churches might evoke a justifiable opposition, and compel the more moderate to build their chapel by the side of the church. This was the case with the Arminians (Remonstrants), who formed not so much a sect, as a fraction of the Reformed Church.

§ 233.

A. ANABAPTISTS (MENNONITES.)

Schyn, Historia Christianorum, qui in Belgio Fœderato, Mennonitæ appellantur. Amstel 1723. 8, *Hunzinger*, das religiöse Kirchen-und Schulwesen der Mennoniten. Speier 181. 8. *Göbel*, Geschichte des Christl. Lebens in d. Rhein. Westph. Kirche, ii. 290 sq. For the rest of the literature see the works on Church History.—[*Hase*, 431, 610, and his Reich d. Wiedertäufer in his Neue Propheten, and separately, 1860. *Hochmuth* in Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol. 1858–9. *Gieseler's* Church Hist., (N. Y.) Vol. iv., § 30, 32. *J. J. Van Osterzee* in Herzog's Realencyclop. *Heberle*, Die Anfänge des Anabapst. in der Schweiz, Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1858. Supplement to Neal's Hist. of Puritans. *J. Ivimey*, Hist. of Eng. Baptists. *G. H. Orchard*, Hist. of Foreign Baptists, 1855. Publications of Hansard Knollys Soc. England. Martyrology of Baptist Churches, from the Dutch of *P. J. Van Beaght*, 2, Lond. 1850–3. *Backus*. Hist. of English and Am. Baptists; 2, 1772–84, and often reprinted. *T. F. Curtis*, Progress of Baptist Principles, N. Y., 1855. *S. S. Cutting*, Hist. Vindications, Bost. 1859. *C. A. Cornelius*, Die Wiedertäufer, 1860,—second part of his Gesch. d. münsterischen Aufruhrs.]

Infant Baptism was at first opposed by rude enthusiasts and the promoters of revolution.[1] But, at a later period, about the middle of the sixteenth century, *Menno Simonis*,[2] a native of Holland, succeeded in collecting those who held these views concerning baptism, and in constituting a regular denomination, which took the name of *Mennonites*, and, in the course of time, divided itself into several smaller bodies.[3] The earliest confession of faith adopted by the Mennonites, is that drawn up by *John Ries*, and *Lübbert Gerardi*, about the year 1580.[4] Other confessions of faith do not enjoy such general authority among the adherents of this sect.[5]

[1] Concerning the first movements of the prophets of Zwickau (*Nicholas Storch*, *Martin Cellarius* [Borhaus], *Mark Stübner*, and *Thomas Münzer*) and of *Carlstadt*, as well as concerning the Anabaptists of Switzerland, and the negotiations with them (*Grebel*, *Manz*, *Hochrütener*, *Hubmeier*, and others); and also, respecting the disturbances made by the Anabaptists of Münster (*Rottman*, *Bochold*, *Knipperdolling*), see the works on the history of the Reformation. Concerning their doctrines (though from the polemical point of view) see *Melancthon's* Vorlegung etlicher unchristlicher Artikel, welche die Wiedertäufer vorgeben, in the German works of *Luther*, Vol. ii. of the edition of Wittenberg, p. 282 ss. . . . . *Justus Menius*, de Weidertäufer, Lehre und Geheimniss aus heil. Schrift widerlegt. ibid. p. 299 ss.— *Bullinger*, von der Wiedertaufe Ursprung, Secten und Wesen. Zür. 1561. 4 *Ott*, Annales anabaptistici. Bas. 1624. [*C. A. Cornelius*, Gesch. des münsterischen Aufruhs, in 3 Büchern, i. 1855; ii. Die Widertaufe 1860.] *Hast*, Gesch. Widertäufer, Münster, 1836. The remarkable mixture of (montanistic) fanaticism, transgressing the limits of Scripture, with narrow-minded adherence to the letter of Scripture, was already remarked upon by *Zuingle*; see his works (edited by Schuler and Schulthess) ii. 1. p. 298: "*Sometimes they insist upon taking the letter in its strict sense, without understanding it and without any interpretation; sometimes they wholly refuse to admit it.*"

[2] *Menno* was born A. D. 1505, and died 1561. The *fundamental principles* of Mennonitism are: The rejection of infant baptism, the refusal to take oaths, and to serve in the army, and lastly, the rite of washing the feet.

[3] Waterlandians and Flamingians, the more refined and the more rude. Concerning their further gradations, and the entire history of that sect and its spread, see the works on ecclesiastical history.

[4] It appeared under the title: Korde Belydenisse des Geloofs, etc.: Præcipuorum Christianæ Fidei Articulorum brevis Confessio. 1580. The Latin edition which is given by *Schyn* l. c. c. 7, p. 172 ss. consists of 40 articles. [On the Confessions of the English Baptists see *Cutting*, ubi supra, and the work of *Underhill*, for Hansard Knollys Soc. referred to § 222, last Note.]

[5] Comp. *Schyn* l. c. *Köcher*, Bibl. Symb. p. 467 ss. *Winer*, pp. 24, 25. (Concerning their Catechisms, see ibid.)

§ 234.

B. UNITARIANS (SOCINIANS.)

Sandii, C. C. Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum. Freist. (Amst.) 1684. 8. *Bock, F. S.*, Historia Antitrinitariorum, maxime Socinianismi et Socinianorum. Regiomont. 1774–84. **Trechsel*, die protestantischen Antitrinitarier vor Faustus Socinus. 1. Buch. Michael Servet und seine Vorgänger. Heidelb. 1839. 8; 2. Buch. Lelio Socino und die Antitrinit. seiner Zeit. 1844. *O. Fock*, der Socinianismus nach seiner Stellung in der Gesammtentwicklung des Christl. Lebens, nach seinem Verlauf, und nach seinem Lehrbegriffe, Kiel, 1847. *Hilgenfeld*, Kritische Studien über den Socinianismus, in Zeller's Jahrbücher, 1848, s. 371, sq. [*Fock*, in Zeitschrift f. d. Hist. Theol., 1845. Literatur des Socin. ibid., 1853. *J. P. Bauermeister*, de Syst. Socin. Dogmat. Comment. tres. Rostock, 1830–3. *L. Lange*, Gesch. des Lehrbegriffs des Socinian. Leips. 1831. *Baur*, Lehre d. Dreieinigkeit, iii., 46, sq. *Dorner*, Lehre v. d. Person Christi, ii., 751, sq. *Th. Lindsey*, Hist. View of Unit. from the Reformation, Lond. 1783, and Mem. of L., by *Belsham*, Lond. 1812. *Thos. Rees*, Racovian Catechism, with Hist. Introd. Lond. 1818. *Wallace*, Anti-Trinitarian Biography. *J. R. Beard*, Historical Illustrations of Trinity, Lond. 1846.]

While infant baptism and other doctrines were opposed on practical grounds, the orthodox dogma of the Trinity was, about the same time, attacked from the theoretical point of view, so that the history of the first Unitarians, from the period of the Reformation, appears in many aspects entangled with that of the Anabaptists.[1] The violent persecutions, by which both Roman Catholics and Protestants endeavoured to suppress Unitarianism,[2] most marked in the execution of *Michael Servetus*,[3] could not prevent the formation of a sect,[4] which maintained, that a plurality of persons in the Deity could not be proved from the Scripture, though they acknowledged its Divine origin, and professed all reverence for the human person of Christ. By the labors of *Lælius Socinus*,[5] and still more of his nephew *Faustus Socinus*,[6] the scattered Unitarian party were united into a distinct church organization, and adopted the name of *Socinians*. The onesided rationalistic tendency of Socinianism included the germs both of later Rationalism (negatively), and of a merely external biblical Supernaturalism (positively), and thus contributed to the transition from one period to another.[7] The appellation *Racovienses*, which is also applied to the Socinians, as well as the name of their catechism, Catechismus Racoviensis, were derived from the Polish town Racow.[8] Besides the authors of that catechism, the following theologians more fully developed the Socinian doctrine —viz. *Jonas Schlichting*, *J Völkel*, *John* and *Samuel Crell*, *Christian Ostorodt*, *Valentine Schmalz*, *Lewis Wolzogen*, *Andrew Wissowatius*, and others.[9] [The controversy passed over into England, where it was continued by Bishop Bull,[10] and especially by Clarke and Waterland in the early part of the eighteenth century.[11]]

[1] "*That which the Anabaptists attempted in reference to the Church and to practical religion, other theologians, of a tendency closely allied to it, and largely impregnated with Anabaptistic elements, sought to accomplish in reference to theology. The latter tendency was, properly speaking, only a distinct branch of the former, and a particular form and expression of the same general movement.*" *Trechsel*, l. c. p. 8. What was said § 232, concerning the onesided rationalistic system of criticism (which apparently forms a *contrast* to the fanaticism of the Anabaptists) has primary reference to the later development of Unitarianism by Socinus. Comp. note 7, and *Trechsel*, pp. 3 and 4. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Compend. i. pp. 332, 333, also regards the Antitrinitarians as the speculative opposition, the Anabaptists as the practical one.

[2] Among the earlier Antitrinitarians we may mention: *Lewis Hetzer*, of Bischofszell in the Thurgau (Switzerland); he was executed at Constance A. D. 1529; *John Denck*, a native of the Upper-Palatinate. [On *Denck* and *Hetzer*, see Gieseler, iv. 351; *Keim*, in Zeitschrift f. d. Hist. Theol., 1856, and in Herzog's Realencyclop. sub voce; *Hefele*, in Stud. u. Kritiken, 1855.] *Jacob Kautz*, of Bockenheim; *Conrad in Gassen*, a native of Wirtemberg (he was executed at Basle A. D. 1559); *John Campanus*, a native of Holland, who was professor in the University of Wittenberg; *Melchior Hofmann*, at Strasburg; *Adam Pistoris*, and *Rudolph Martini*, both natives of Westphalia; *David Joris*, of Bruges, an Anabaptist [comp. *Gieseler*, iv. 353, Note 9], and *Claudius of Savoy*. On their doctrines, concerning which they widely differed, inasmuch as some adopted the notions of Arius, others those of Sabellius, or of Paul of Samosata, compare *Trechsel*, l. c. (Section i.), and the special history of doctrines. *John Valdez*, a native of Spain, who died A. D. 1540 at Naples, is also numbered by some writers, not only among the promoters of the Reformation, but also among the forerunners of Unitarianism; on the other side, comp. *Sandius*, loc. cit. 2–6, and *C. Schmid*, in Illgens Zeitschrift für historische Theologie, i. 4. p. 837.

[3] *Servetus*, surnamed *Reves*, was born A. D. 1509, or 1511, at Villaneuva, in the kingdom of Arragon, accompanied the Emperor Charles V. on his expedition to Italy (1529), took up his residence in Basle, 1530 (with Œcolampadius), and wrote (1531) his work entitled: De Trinitatis Erroribus, libri VII. Afterwards he abode several times in France, etc. His trial and execution took place at Geneva, A. D. 1553. Concerning the history of his life, see *Mosheim*, neue Nachrichten von dem berühmten span. Arzte, Michael Serveto, Helmst., 1756, 4; and *Trechsel*, l. c. [On *Servetus*, see *Henry*, Leben Calvin, iii. 95; *Baur's* Dreieinigkeit, iii. 54; *Heberle*, in Tübing. theol. Zeitschrift, 1840; *A. Rilliet*, Relation du Procès criminel contre M. Servet, Genève, 1844; *Schade*, Etude sur le Procès, Strasb., 1853, *Saisset*, in Revue des deux Mondes, Feb., Mar., 1848; Calvin and Servetus, by *T. K. Tweedie*, Edinb.; Calv. and Serv., by *T. S. Porter*, Lond., 1854; Bulletin de la Société pour l'Hist. du Protest. Français, 1858.]

[4] To this sect belonged also *John Valentin Gentilis* (he was executed at Berne A. D. 1566); *Paul Alciat* (who died at Dantzic, 1565), *Matthæus Gribaldi* (his death took place 1564 in Savoy), *George Blandrata* (who lived in

Poland and Transylvania, and died 1590), and in some measure (?) *Bernard Ochino* (he died 1564 in Moravia), *Celius Sec. Curio* (he died 1569), *Pau. Vergerius* (he died 1565), and several others. From the middle of the sixteenth century Antitrinitarian principles were chiefly spread in Poland. The Socinians formed themselves into a distinct ecclesiastical body at the Synods of Pinczow and Petrikow (1563–65.) [See *F. Meyer*, Die evang. Gemeinde io Locarno, 2 Bde., Zurich, 1836. *Heberle*, on Blandrata in Tübing. Zeitschrift f. Theol., 1840. *Bock*, in Hist. Antitrinit.]

[5] *Lælius Socinus* was born at Siena A. D. 1525, and died 1562.—See *C. F. Illgen*, Vita Lælii Socini. Lips., 1814, 8. *J. C. Orelli*, Lælius Socinus, in the Basler Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift., 1824, part 3, p. 28. ss., and the requisite documents, ibid., p. 138, ss. [*Gieseler*, Vol. iv. p. 358.]

[6] *Faustus Socinus* was born A. D. 1539, and died 1604. Comp. the memoir of his life by *Pizipcovius* in Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum (note 9), P. i. He chiefly labored in Poland and Transylvania. *Baumgarten-Crusius* justly designates Lælius Socinus "*the spiritual father of Socinianism*," and Faustus Socinus "*the founder of the sect.*" Compend. i. p. 334. [*Gieseler*, iv. 365.]

[7] "*We may call Socinianism the common birth-place at once of the Supranaturalism and the Rationalism of modern Protestant theology.*" *Strauss*, christliche Glaubenslehre, i. p. 56.

[8] An older Socinian Catechism was composed by *George Schomann*, a Socinian minister in Cracow, who died A. D. 1591. It was followed by that of F. Socinus, which appeared under the title: Christianæ Religionis brevissima Institutio per interrogationes et responsiones, quam Catechismum vulgo vocant. Racov., 1618, 8. (It was incomplete, inasmuch as it includes only theology and christology.) It formed the basis of the larger Socinian catechism, which was composed by *Hieronymus Moscorovius*, a Polish nobleman, who died 1625, and *Valentin Schmalz*, a Socinian minister, and published 1605, 12, in the Polish language. It was translated into Latin under the title: Catechesis Ecclesiarum, quæ in regno Polon. et magno ducatu Lithuaniæ et aliis ad istud regnum pertinentibus provinciis affirmant, neminem alium præter patrem domini nostri J. C. esse illum unum Deum Israelis, hominem autem illum, Jesum Naz, qui ex virgine natus est, nec alium præter aut ante ipsum, Dei filium unigenitum et agnoscunt et confitentur. Racov., 1609, 12.—A new edition, together with a refutation, was published by *G. L. Oeder*, Francf. and Leips., 1739, 8; here the questions are for the first time numbered. [This Catechism was ordered to be burnt by the Parliament of England, in 1652. It was translated, with Notes and Illustrations, and a Sketch of the History of Unitarianism, by Thos. Rees, Lond., 1818. Extracts in *Gieseler*, iv. 367, *sq.*] Concerning other editions, which also contain other confessions of faith adopted by the Socinians (the Confessio Fidei drawn up by Joh. Schlichting, 1646, 8,) comp. *Winer*, pp. 25, 26.

[9] Their writings are collected in the Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum, quos Unitarios vocant. Irenop. [Amst.], 1626, 6 vols., fol. For further particulars, see *Winer*, p. 27. [On the division into Non-Adorantes (Davidis), and Adorantes, see *Gieseler*, iv. 569, *sq.* The doctrine of the *Ador*

antes in Summa Universæ Theol. Christ., 1787, from the papers of Michael Lombard Sz. Abrahami, died 1658, ed. by *George Markos.*]

[10] [Bp. *Bull's* (see § 225, b., Note 18) Defensio Fidei Nicæn., was published in 1685, (written several years previous, but could not find a publisher), and was directed against *Sandius* (a Socinian, died at Amst., 1680), author of Nucleus Hist. Eccles. exhibitus in Hist. Arian., and collector of the Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar.); *Zuicker*, b. 1612, a physician of Dantzic, author of Irenicum Irenicorum, 1658, also a Socinian; and in fact against the position of Petavius as to the views and authority of the Fathers. Bull's Judicum Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, 1694, is in part against the views of Episcopius and Curcellæus (successor of Episcopius at Amsterdam, died 1658), who had also been attacked by Maresius, 1650, in his Defensio Fidei Cathol. His Primitive and Apostolic Tradition, 1703, in continuation of the controversy, is against the Socinian interpretation of the views of the early fathers. —Among the English Socinian writers of this period, were *Dr. Arthur Bury*, The Naked Gospel, 1690 (a Historical Vindication of the same is ascribed to Le Clerc): *John Biddle*, d. 1662, Tracts, 3 vols., reprint, 1691–5; *Thos. Firmin*, d. 1697, Life, Lond., 1698, with an account of the Unit. controversy; and *Gilbert Clerke*, who in his Ante-Nicenismus, 1695, and other works, replied to Bull's Defensio.]

[11] [*Samuel Clarke's* (see § 225, b. Note 51) Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity was published in 1712 (see vol. fourth of his Works, containing his further controversial writings on the subject), advocating the high Arian view. It was answered by *Dr. Wells*, 1713, *Nelson*, *Jas. Knight*, Bp. *Gastrell*, *Dr. John Edwards* (who also opposed Bull's subordination scheme), *Welchman*, *Ewd. Potter*, *Richard Mayo*, and others.—In 1719 *Dr. Daniel Waterland* published his Vindication of Christ's Divinity, a Defence of some Queries (1726), in relation to Clarke's scheme, in Answer to Jackson, (b. 1686, d. 1763), and a second Vindication in 1732; and a further Vindication, 1734 (Works, vol. i. ii. iii.) *Daniel Whitby* (b. 1638, d. 1726), when he published his Commentaries was orthodox, but in 1715 wrote Disquisitiones Modestæ in Clariss. Bulli Defens. Fid. Nic., to show that the controversy between Clarke and Waterland was not decided by Christian antiquity. Waterland replied (Works, ii. 232–279); Whitby's rejoinder, 1720, and Waterland's Answer, 1720; Whitby's Last Thoughts. *Jackson* also wrote (aided by Clarke), a Reply to Waterland, 1722, and remarks on W.'s Second Defence by Philalethes Cantabrig.—*Edm. Calamy's* Sermons on Trinity, 1722. *Webster*, in 1735, at Waterland's request, translated Mainbourg's Hist. of Arianism.—*William Whiston*, b. 1667, d. 1732, in his Prim. Christ. Revived, 5 vols., 1711–12, and on Primitive Liturgies, 2d ed., Lond., 1730.—*A. A. Sykes*, Modest Plea and Modest Plea continued (this latter, 1720, by Clarke).—*Thomas Emlyn* was also a leading advocate of Arianism (b. 1663, d. 1743), Works, 3 vols., Lond., 1746—the first two volumes chiefly on this controversy in reply to Stillingfleet, Bennet, Willis, Leslie, etc. The Rom. Cath. divine *Hawarden*, also wrote an acute Answer to Dr. Clarke, and Mr. Whiston, etc., by H. E., Lond., 1729.—For the History of this controversy, see *Van Mildert's* Life of Waterland (prefixed to W.'s works); life of Clarke; Whiston's Memoirs, 3 vols., 1749–50; Whis-

ton's Mem. of Clarke, 1730: *Disney's* Life of Sykes; *Nelson's* Life of Bull; Toulmin's Life of Biddle; *Lindsey's* Hist. Unitarianism. On the question of the Unitarianism of Milton, Locke, and Newton, see Hales' on Trinity; King's Life of Locke; Unit. Tracts, Bost., No. 77; *Smythe*, in Southern Presb. Rev., 1854. On Milton's Christ. Doctrines, see Bib. Sacra, 1860. For a full list of the works in the above Trinitarian Controversy, see Watt's Bibliotheca Britannica, 4 vols., Edinb., 1824, and the Biographia Britan., 7 vols., fol., 1747.]

§ 235.

C. ARMINIANS (REMONSTRANTS.)

Regenboog, Geschichte der Remonstranten. Transl. from the Dutch. Lemgo, 1781. **Abr. des Amorie van der Hœven*, het tweede Eeuwfest van het Seminarium der Remonstranten, Leeuwarden. 1830. 8. [For the literature of the controversy, see Gieseler (N. Y. edition) iv., § 43, p. 505.—The works of *Uytenbogært*, *Triglandius*, *Brandt*, *Regenboog*, *Mosche*, *G. S. Franckius*, De Hist. Dogm. Armin., Killiae, 1813. *Brandt's* History transl., 4 vols., Lond. 1720–23, 1770. *Schweizer*, Protest. Centraldogmen, ii., 31–201. *Gass*, Gesch. d. Protest. Dogmatik, ii. *Graf*, Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Synode von Dordrecht, Basel, 1825. *John Hales'*, Hist. Conc. Dord, ed. Mosheimius, Hamb. 1724: and in *Hales'* Golden Remains, 1673, 1690. *Thos. Scott*, Articles of Synod of Dort, Works, vol. 8; Utica, 1821, and often. Article Arminius, by *Pelt* in Herzog's Realencyclop.]

Excluded from the Reformed Church, on account of their more moderate views concerning predestination, the *Arminians* found themselves compelled to form a distinct religious community,[1] the principles of which are contained both in the Five Articles of the Remonstrants (A. D. 1610),[2] and in the confession of faith drawn up by *Simon Episcopius*.[3] Arminianism is characterized not only by holding to the universality of the provision for redemption, but also by a kind of moderate orthodoxy, almost imperceptibly commingled with heterodox elements, and has chief respect to the moral rather than the rigid dogmatic element. As regards its tendency, it is, in some respects, allied to the sober common sense of Socinianism, but it has, at the same time, preserved a sufficient amount of positive religion, to oppose the special negative doctrines of that creed. Next to *Arminius* himself, and *Simon Episcopius*, *Hugo Grotius*,[4] and *Philip a Limborch*,[5] were the most distinguished of the Arminian theologians, the former in his philosophico-apologetic and exegetical writings, the latter in his doctrinal works. The Arminian Church numbered also among its members many eminent men,[6] who exerted a beneficial reaction upon Protestantism by their thorough scientific attainments no less than by the mildness of their sentiments.[7] [On English Arminians, see § 225, b., Note 15, etc.]

[1] *Arminius* (Harmsen, or Hermann,) was born A. D. 1560 at Oudewater, taught from the year 1603 theology in the university at Leyden, and died 1609. His theological works were published, Lugd. Bat. 1629, 4. On the controversy between him and his colleague, *Franciscus Gomarus*, and its consequences, see the works on ecclesiastical history. [Life and death of Arminius and Episcopius, Lond., 1672; Life of A. by *Brandt*, transl. by *John Guthrie*, Lond., 1855; by *N. Bangs*, New York, 1844. Works of Arminius, transl., 3 vols., Auburn, New York, 1852 (a more complete ed. than that of *Jas. Nichols*, Lond., 3 vols., 1825–8). *Moses Stuart*, The Creed of Arminius (to show that he was not an Arminian), Bibl. Repos., 1831. Articles on *Arminius* by *Warren*, in Meth. Qu. (N. Y.), 1857, also in vol. iv.; Christ. Examiner, 1860; Lit. and Theol. Rev., vol. vi.—*Francis Gomarus*, the chief opponent of Arminius, b. 1563, Prof. Leyden, 1594, at Saumur, 1614, at Groningen, 1618, d. 1641; Opera Theol., 2d ed., Amst., 1664.]

[2] They were presented to the States of Holland and West-Friesland under the title: Remonstrantia, Libellus Supplex exhibitus Hollandiæ et Westfrisiæ Ordinibus; they are reprinted in *Walch*, Religionsstreitigkeiten ausser der lutherischen Kirche, iii. p. 540, ss. [In *Gieseler*, iv. (N. Y. ed.), p. 508, Note.]

[3] *Simon Episcopius* (Bishop) was born A. D. 1583, and died 1643. Confessio seu Declaratio Sententiæ Pastorum, qui in fœderato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur, super præcipuis Articulis Relig. Christ., Harderov., 1622, 4 (in Sim. Episc. Opp. ii. 2, p. 69, ss.) It consists of 25 chapters. Concerning the different editions and translations of that confession see *Clarisse*, Encycl. Theol. p. 443; and *Winer*, p. 23.—Episcopius wrote his Apologia pro Confessione, etc., 1629 (1630?) 4, Opp. p. 95, ss., in reply to the Censura in Confess. Remonstr. (Lugd. Bat., 1626), composed by *J. Polyander*, *Andrew Rivetus*, *Anton Walæus*, and *Ant. Thysius*, all of them professors in the university of Leyden. As regards several other controversial matters, comp. Episcopii Verus Theologus Remonstrans, ibid. p. 208, ss. In addition Episcopius wrote Institutiones Theologicæ, libri iv. (incomplete; Opp. [Amst., 1650, 65, Tom. ii. fol.] Tom. i.) On the catechisms composed by *John Uytenbogard*, and *Bartholomew Prævostius*, see *Winer*, l. c. *Hoppe* in Herzog's Realencyclop., iv. 100. [Another ed. of Episcopius, Opera, 2 fol., Lond., 1678; his Conf. Fidei, and Apologia, ii. 69–284. *Limborch*, Vita Episcopii, Amst., 1701.]

[4] *Grotius* was born A. D. 1583, and died 1645. To clear himself from the charge of Socinianism, he wrote his Defensio Fidei Catholicæ de Satisfactione Christi, 1617, 8.—De Veritate Rel. Christ. Lugd. Bat., 1627, 12.—Opp. Theol. Amst., 1679, iii. f., 1697, iv. fol. Bas., 1731, iv. f. (the three first volumes contain writings of an exegetical character). See **Luden*, Hugo Grotius nach seinen Schicksalen und Schriften, Berlin, 1806. [Opera, Lond., 3 vols., in 4 fol., 1679. Truth of Christ. Relig., transl. by John Clarke, Lond., 1793, 1860. Life by *Chs. Butler*, Lond., 1826. Life by *M. de Burigny*, transl. Lond., 1754. Grotian Theory of Atonement, from *Baur*, by *Swain*, Bib. Sacra, ix. Articles on G., by *Osgood*, Christ. Exam., 42; in Southern Rev., vol. i. Grotius and the Sources of International Law

in Edinb. Rev., Oct., 1860—to show that he introduced the Protestant principle into the exposition of the law of nations.]

[6] *Limborch* was born A. D. 1633, professor in the Gymnasium of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam, and died 1712. His Theologia Christiana appeared Amst., 1686, Basil., 1735, fol. "*The most complete exposition of the Arminian doctrine is the celebrated work by Philip a Limborch, ...a man distinguished for genius, learning, and modesty, whose literary labors are of great value. The very arrangement of his system displays originality....Admirable perspicuity and judicious selection of the material characterise the entire work;*" *Stäudlin*, Geschichte der theologischen Wissenschaften, i. p. 319. [Limborch's Complete System or Body of Divinity, transl. with Improvements from Wilkins, Tillotson, Scott, and others, by *Wm. Jones*, 2, 8vo., Lond., 1702. His Hist. of Inquisition, transl. by *Saml. Chandler*, fol., Lond., 1731.]

[6] The following were distinguished writers on dogmatic theology: *Stephen Curcellæus*, the successor of Episcopius; he was born A. D. 1586, and died 1659. He wrote Institutio Relig. Christ. Libb. V, in Opp. Theol. Amst., 1675, f. (incomplete.)—*Andr. a Cattenburgh* was born 1664, and died 1743. He wrote: Spicilegium Theol. Christ. Philippi a Limborch, Amst., 1726, f. —Bibl. Scriptor. Remonstrantium. [*John le Clerc*, b. at Geneva, 1657, d. 1736, a universal scholar. Account of his Life and Writings, Lond., 1712. Vetus Test., 4 fol., Amst., 1710; New Test., 1799; Of Incredulity, transl. Lond., 1697; Bibliothèque Universelle et Test., 26 vols., Amst., 1686–93. Bibl. choisie, 28 vols., 1703–13; Bibl. Ancienne et Moderne, 29 vols., 1714–27.]

[7] *The Arminian principle which renounced the authority of the symbolical books, gave such an impulse to exegetical investigations, to independent hermeneutical labors, and to the speculative treatment of theology, that in consequence of the influence exerted by the works of Episcopius and Hugo Grotius, it was introduced into the whole Evangelical Church. Thus a general desire manifested itself in the Protestant Church of Germany, to do away with the authority of the symbolical books.*" *Schleiermacher*, Kirchengeschichte, p. 620. Comp. *Gass*, loc. cit., 435: "*The Arminian divines constantly make a discount upon the dogmas, and introduce flowing lines among their sharp outlines, and so keep up a moderate or abbreviated orthodoxy, no longer confined to the symbolical books, and which is, by way of contrast, to be supported by practical piety and moral zeal.*"

§ 236.

D. QUAKERS.

H. Crœsii Historia Quakeriana. Amstel. 1695. ed. 2. 1703. 8. Quäker historie, Berlin. *W. Sewel*, Geschichte von dem Ursprunge des christlichen Volkes, so Quaker genannt werden, [from the English, publ. fol., Lond. 1722]. *H. Tuke*, die Religionsgrundsätze, zu welchen die Geselschaft der Quäker sich bekennt. Transl. from the English [1805], Leipz. 1828. *J. J. Gurney*, Observations on the Peculiarities of the Society of Friends, Lond. 1824. [*Penn*, Summary of the History, Doctrines, and

Discipline of the Society of Friends, Lond. 1694, ed. 6, 1707. *Gough*, History of the People called Quakers, 4 vols., Dubl. 1789. *Thos. Clarkson*, Portraiture of Quakerism, 3 vols., Lond. 1806. *W. R. Wagstaff*, Hist. Soc. of Friends, Lond. 1855, *Thos. Elwood*, Sacred Hist. 3, 8vo., 1778. *Neal's* Hist. Puritans, Supplement to vol. 3. *S. M. Janney*, Hist. Soc. Friends, 4 vols., 1828 (1859). *Fothergill, Fox, Sheppard, Rowntree*, (prize essay), *Hancock*, on Causes of Decline of Quakerism, 1859–60. Comp. Westminst. Rev. 1852, and North Brit. Rev. 1860. Summary of Hist. Doctrine and Discipline of Friends, written at the desire of the Meeting for Sufferings in London, 3d ed. Lond. 1844. Epistles of the Yearly Meetings, 1675–1759, fol., Lond. 1760 from 1681 to 1817, Lond. 1818.]

The principles of the Quakers are in some points allied with those of the Anabaptists (as regards *e. g.* the relation of the internal to the external word, etc.). After the fire of enthusiasm kindled by *George Fox*,[1] the founder of this sect, had gradually subsided, the Society of Friends, under their leader *William Penn*,[2] obtained (A. D. 1689) the confidence of the English government. But it was especially in the United States (Pennsylvania) that this sect gained numerous adherents, though it also spread in other countries. *Robert Barclay*, a Scotchman, set forth their doctrines, if we may so term them, in a systematic form, and drew up a confession of faith.[4]

[1] *Fox* was a shoemaker, born in the county of Leicester, held fanatical notions, and died 1691. He founded the Society of Friends (to whom the nickname Quaker was given) A. D. 1649, amid the commotions of the English revolution. [Life of Fox, by *J. S. Watson*, Lond. 1860. Retrospective Rev., Aug. 1854. A list of his publications in Bibl. Britann. Works, 3 fol., 1694–8. New ed. 8 vols., Philadelphia. *S. M. Janney*, Life of Fox, Phil. 1853.]

[2] *Penn* was the son of the celebrated admiral of the same name, entertained more moderate opinions than Fox, died A. D. 1718. See the memoirs of his life by *Marsillac*, Par. 1791, 8, transl. into German, Strasb. 1793, 8. *Th. Clarkson*, Memoirs of the private and public Life of W. Penn, Lond. 1813, ii. 8. Morgenblatt, 1816, Feb. Nos., 43–47. Penn himself wrote: *A Summary of the history, doctrine and discipline of Friends.* Ed. 6, Lond. 1707, 8, (transl. into German by *Seebohm*, Pyrmont, 1792. [Works, 2 fol., 1726. No Cross, no Crown, 13th ed. Lond. 1789. *W. H. Dixon*, William Penn, an historical Biog., with a chapter on the Macaulay Charges, Lond. 1851, new ed., 1856. *A. J. Paget*, Inquiry into Macaulay's Charges, Lond., 1859. *M. L. Vulliemin*, Guillaume Penn, Paris, 1856. *Geo. Bancroft*, Hist. United States, vol. ii., chap. xvi.]

[3] Their first settlement in the United States took place A. D. 1681. From the year 1686 they enjoyed toleration in England. But it was not till the eighteenth century that they gained any adherents on the Continent (the community existing in Pyrmont was founded 1791). See *Ludw. Seebohm*, Kurze Nachr. von dem Entstehn und dem Forgang der christlichen Gesellschaft der Freunde. Pyrmont, 1792.

[4] 1. Theologiæ vere Christianæ Apologia. Amsterdam 1676, 4°. Ger-

man translations of it appeared 1648, 1740, 8. 2. Catechismus et Fidei Confessio approbata et confirmata communi Consensu et Consilio Patriarcharum, Prophetarum et Apostolorum, Christo ipso inter eos præsidente et prosequente. Rot. 1676, 8. It was originally written in English, (all made up of Bible texts). Collective edition of Barclay's works, by *W. Penn*, 1692. [*Robert Barclay*, b. 1648, d. 1690. See the article in *Allibone's* Dict. of Authors. His first work, 1670, Truth cleared of Calumnies (against *William Mitchell*); two other treatises, to 1671. In 1675, Catechism and Confess. of Faith; Anarchy of Ranters, 1676; Universal Love, 1677; on Immediate Revelation, 1679. His chief work, An Apology for the true Christ. Divinity, 1678, on the basis of Theses Theologicae, previously propounded and sent to all parts. This has been frequently reprinted and translated into most of the languages of Europe. Against it, *Thos. Bennet's* Confutation, 1705, and other English as well foreign divines; Arnold, of Francker, Baier of Jena, Anton Reiser, Barthold Holzfuss, Ben. Figken, etc.]

§ 237.

ATTEMPTS AT UNION (SYNCRETISM.)

C. W. Hering, Geschichte der kirchlichen Unionsversuche, seit der Reformation bis auf unsere Zeit., Leipz. 1836–38, ii. [Comp. also § 218, note 2.] *H. Schmid*, Gesch. d Synkretist Streitigkeiten, Erlang, 1846. *W. Gass*, Geo. Calixt. u. der Synkretismus, Breslau, 1846 [and in his Gesch. d. Dogmatik, ii., 67–216.] *Heppe*, die alt Protest. Union (Confessionelle Entwicklung), p. 252 sq. [Gieseler, iv., § 51, 52. *C. G. Neudecker*, Die Hauptversuche zur Pacification der Evang. Protest. Kirche Deutschlands, Leipz. 1846. *Henke*, Geo. Calixtus und seine Zeit, ii., Halle, 1853–60; comp. *Hundeshagen* in Stud. u. Kritik., 1856. *Schweizer*, Centraldogmen, ii., 532 sq. *Niedner*, Gesch. d. Kirche, 743–7. Christ. Remembrancer, Lond. 1855, on Calixt and the Peace-makers.]

Though the different religious parties were at that time strongly opposed to each other, there were, nevertheless, attempts to effect a union between the Lutherans and Calvinists[1] on the one side, and between Protestants and Roman Catholics on the other.[2] These efforts tended to relax the stiffness of dogmas, but also to emasculate what was characteristic in them. The sects, too, exerted a reacting influence on the greater ecclesiastical bodies, since the mystics, who still adhered to the church, agreed in essential points with the Anabaptists and Quakers.[3] Arminianism and even Socinianism, so influenced sober common sense theologians, that they became favorable to greater concessions.[4]

[1] As early as the time of the conflicts to which the Reformation gave rise, *Martin Bucer* and *Philip Landgrave of Hesse*, endeavoured to allay the demon of dissension. [On *Cassander*, see Gieseler, iv. 577; on *De Dominis*, p. 579; *Junius*, p. 580. In the year 1614, the Calvinist, *David Pareus*, d. 1622, took steps towards the effectual establishment of such a union. His

work, "Irenicum," in which he made use of the word Syncretism, may be regarded as the forerunner of the writings of Calixt on the same subject. Comp. *Gass.* in the work quoted § 218, Note 2, p. 8.] Among the Lutherans, *Calixt* endeavoured, in the course of the seventeenth century, to reconcile the separate parties, and thus gave rise to what is called the Syncretistic controversy; among Calvinists, *John Durœus*, a Scotchman, labored from the year 1630 for the same object. [*Dury* died in 1680, in Cassel; from 1626 he was preacher to the Puritan Colony at Elbing, in Prussia; he journeyed widely for his project, and wrote Consultatio Theologica super Negotio Pacis Eccles., Lond., 1641; commented on by Hunnius, 1641. For the other works of Dury, see *Gieseler*, iv., § 51, Note 28. See *Berzelius*, Comm. Hist. Theol. de J. Duræo, cum Præf. *J. L. Moshemii*, Helmst. 1744. Bishop Hall was influenced by Dury to write his Pax Terris, in Duræi Irenicorum Tractat. Prodromus: and *Bishop Davenant*, De Pace inter Evangelicos, Lond. 1638.] The Conference of Leipsic, A. D. 1631. The Conference of Thorn, 1648. (Colloquium charitativum.) [The Consensus Sandomiriensis; see the "Historical Account of the Consensus Sandomiriensis, or Agreement of Sandomir, formed among the three orthodox bodies of Protestants in Poland, in the year 1570," in the Continental Echo, for 1846, p. 84 ss. 110 ss. 139 ss. *Hugo Grotius*, Votum pro Pace Ecclesiastica, 1642. *Nicolas Hunnius*, project of a Collegium Irenicum of ten or twelve thelogians, 1632; see *Niedner*, 779.]

[2] *Bossuet* (see § 227, Note 14). *Rouas* (Roxas) *de Spinola* (bishop of Tina in Croatia from the year 1668, and bishop of Wienerisch-Neustadt from the year 1685; he died 1695) entered into negotiations with *Molanus*, abbot of Loccum in Hanover. *Leibnitz* took part in the negotiations. [*Molanus* was overseer of church affairs in Brunswick and Hanover; his project, Regulæ circa Christianorum omnium ecclesiasticum Reunionem, was published in 1691; his Cogitationes Privatæ, on the basis of Cassander, Grotius and Spinola, 1691. *Bossuet* wrote De Scripto cui titulus "Cogit. Privat." Episcopi Meldensis, 1692; *Molanus*, Explicatio Ulterior, 1692. *Leibnitz*, Correspondence with Paul Pelisson, Mdme. de Brinon and Bossuet, 1691–4, 1699–1701, (Opera ed. Duten, i., 507–537; see also Œuvres de Leibnitz, publiées pour la première fois d'apres les manuscrits originaux, par *A. Foucher de Careil*, Paris, Tomes i. ii., 1859–60; and comp. *Ch. de Remusat*, Leibnitz et Bossuet, in Rev. des deux Mondes, Jan. 1861.) Systema theologicum Leibnitii (making large concessions to the Catholics), after the Paris manuscript first ed. in French by *Eymery* (Exposition de la Doctrine de Leibnitz), Paris, 1815; German version By *Rüss and Weiss*, Mainz, 1820; Latin and German by *C. Haas*, Tübing. 1860. Comp. *Schulze*, Ueber die Entdeckung dass L. Katholik gewesen, Götting. 1827. *Guhrauer*, Leibnitz Deutsche Schriften, 1837, ii. Appendix, 65–80.]

[3] Especially in the doctrines concerning internal revelation, justification, etc., (thus they contributed, at least to modify, the direct opposition to the Romish Church).

[4] Comp. § 235, note 7.

§ 238.

INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY. DEISM. APOLOGETICS.

John Leland, a View of the principal deistical writers that have appeared in England in the last and present century, 1754, ii. voll., [5th ed. 1766; new ed., Appendix by *W. L. Brown*, and Introduction by *C. R. Edmonds*, Lond. 1837.] *Thorschmid*, Freidenkerbiblothek. Halle, 1765–67. *Herder*, Adrastea (Werke Zur Philosophie und Geschicte, ix.) **Gotth. Vict. Lechler*, Geschichte des englischen Deismus, Stuttg. 1841. *Carrière*, Die philos. Weltanshauung der Reformationszeit. Stuttg. 1847. *C. Hagen*, Der Geist der Reformation und seine Gegensätze, ii. Erlang, 1843–4. [*Mark Pattison*, Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, in Essays and Reviews, 1860, pp. 279–362.]

And lastly, the religious parties, though divided on so many points, could make common cause in the contest for *Christianity* in general, against a tendency which either renounced the positive authority of revelation, or threatened it in essential relations. As early as the century of the Reformation, a theory of the universe was espoused, now in a deistic, and again in a pantheistic form, especially in Italy, which threatened to become dangerous to the Christian faith in a revelation, as held by Roman Catholics as well as Protestants.[1] Theological science, however, was for the most part unaffected by these tendencies, and even the systems of the schools of the seventeenth century which attained a more definite shape, had, with the exception of the Cartesian philosophy, no particular influence upon the shaping of the Christian dogma, toward which they assumed as far as possible the attitude of neutrality.[2] Towards the end of the period (making the transition to the next) a popular form of philosophy, the so-called philosophy of common sense, made open war against the Christian system. Its advocates are generally known under the name of Freethinkers, Deists or Naturalists. Aiming at practical results, with bold and hasty judgments, they declared war against the belief in revelation adopted by all the confessions,[3] and thus called the slumbering apologists of the Christian Church to re-enter the lists.[4]

[1] "*In the history of the world there are four successive periods, in which open unbelief, and unconcealed enmity to Christianity, went the rounds (so to speak) among the chief nations of Europe. These tendencies originated in the higher spheres of society, and pressed down into the middle class, and were cherished and extolled in both as the height of culture. Italy made the beginning in the fifteenth and sixteenth century; England and France followed in the seventeenth and eighteenth; the series closes in Germany in the nineteenth.*" Der deutsche Protestantismus, s. 53.—Among the philosophers of Italy, the most noted were, *Girolamo Cardano*, born 1501, died 1573; *Bernardino*

Telesio, b. 1508, died 1588, "the forerunner of the French sensualism;" *Giordano Bruno*, burnt at Rome, Feb. 17, 1600. *Julius Cæsar Vanini*, born 1585, executed "as an atheist and blasphemer," at Toulouse, Feb. 9, 1619; *Tomaso Campanella*, b. 1508, d. 1639. The position assumed by these men towards Christianity was, however, different in different instances; some of them retained its positive, particularly its mystical, elements; others, Vanini in particular, were skeptical even to blasphemy. See *Carrière*, ubi supra. [Comp. *H. Ritter*, Die Christl. Philos. Bd. ii. s. 119–146. *Bruno*, in Ecl. Mag., vol. 17.]

[3] *Cartesianism*, almost alone, exerted a more direct influence upon the theology of the *present* period, and, in the first instance, only upon that of the Reformed Church (see § 225, note 1); *Malebranche*, however, introduced this philosophy also into the theology of the Romish Church. [Comp. *Bouillier*, La Philos. Cartésienne, 2 Tom., Paris, 1854. *Kuno Fischer*, Gesch. d. neueren Philos. i. 1855.] *Spinoza* (born A. D. 1632, died 1617), a man of elevated character, stood aloof from all ecclesiastical connections, on which account the theologians of his age took no notice of him. It was not till after his death that the speculative writers on Christian theology turned their attention to his system. [On *Spinoza*, see the histories of philosophy by *Ritter*, *Hegel*, *K. Fischer*, *Erdmann*, *Feuerbach*, and others. *Saintes*, Historie de la Vie et des Ouvrages de Spinoza, 2 vols., Paris, 1842. *Orelli*, Leben und Lehre des Spinoza, 1843, 2d ed., 1850. Œuvres, traduits par *E. Saisset*, nouvelle éd., Paris, 1861.—The discussion between Schelling and Jacobi (1785), revived the interest in his system.—*Trendelenburg*, Spinoza's Grundgedanken, 1850. *Bouillier*, in his Hist. de la Philos., Cartésienne, 1854, vol. i., 300–409.—*Keller*, Spinoza und Leibnitz, Erlang., 1847. *Helfferich*, Spinoza und Leibnitz, 1846. A tract attributed to Leibnitz, Refutation of Spinoza, was published by *Foucher de Careil*, 1854, from a MS. in the Hanover library, transl. into English, Lond., 1855. Articles in Westminster Review, vol. 39 (by *Lewes*); and July, 1855; in Southern Qu. Rev., vol. xii. See also letters between Ripley and Norton, on Latest Form of Infidelity, Bost., 1840; Letter Second, on Spinoza.]—*Locke* born A. D. 1632, died 1704) promoted the interests of the empirical system, which was first established by Francis Bacon of Verulam (who died A. D. 1626), and in its turn contributed to the development of Deism (though counter to the intentions of its author).—[*E. Tagart*, Locke's Life and Writings, historically considered, and vindicated from the charge of contributing to the skepticism of Hume Lond., 1855. *Thos. E. Webb*, Intellectualism of Locke, Lond., 1857. *B. H. Smart*, Thoughts and Language, a Revival of Locke's Philosophy, Lond., 1855. *E. Schärer*, John Locke, seine Verstandestheorie, etc., Leipz., 1860. *V. Cousin*, Psychology, transl. by *C. S. Henry* (Cousin's Criticism of Locke, in his Lecture on Hist. Philos.), 1848. 1859; Comp. President *Day* in Christ. Quart. Spect., vol. vii. Other articles in British Quart., v.; Christ. Exam. (*Bowen*), xxiii.; Edinb. Rev., 1854. *Dugald Stuart's* Philos. Essays, 1 and 3, in Works, vol. iv.]—*Leibnitz* (born 1646, died 1716) interested himself much in theology, as may be seen from his work on Theodicy (comp. § 261, note 7), and the part he took in the attempts at union (see § 237, note 2.) [*Guhrauer*, Leben Leibnitz, 2te,

Ausg., 1846; abridged transl., Boston, 1840. *Zimmermann*, L.'s Monadologie, 1847. La Philosophie de Leibnitz, par *Nourrisson*, Paris, 1860. *Kuno Fischer*, Leibnitz u. seine Schule, 2d vol. of Gesch. d. neueren Philos., Mannheim, 1855. Articles on Leibnitz in North British vol. 5; Edinburgh Rev., vol. 84; Gent. Mag. (*Harwell*), 1852.] But it was not till *Wolf* remodeled his philosophy (in the following period), that it attracted the attention of theologians, and was introduced into their writings.

[3] Concerning the vagueness of these appellations, see *Herder*, l. c. pp. 174, 175. *Lechler*, p. 452, ss.* The so-called Deists differed widely among themselves in character, spirit, and sentiments,† and an equal difference may be observed in the relation in which their systems stand, both to each other and to Christianity. The Deism of England can only be explained in connection with the history of the English Reformation, and the conflicts to which it gave rise. Among its promoters, in addition to the sect of the *Seekers* and *Rationalists* (*Lechler*, p. 61, note), were the following writers: *Herbert of Cherbury* (died 1648), *Thomas Hobbes* (born 1588, d. 1679, at the age of 91), *Charles Blount* (died 1693), *John Toland* (died 1722), *Anthony Collins* (died 1729), *Anthony Ashley Cooper* (Earl of *Shaftesbury*, died 1713), *Thomas Woolston* (died 1733), *Matthew Tindal* (died 1733), *Thomas Chubb* (*an illiterate person*, a glover and chandler, died 1747), and several others who lived in the following period. [See § 238, *a*.]—In France, *Jean Bodin* (died 1596, author of the Heptaplomeres, published anew by Guhrauer, 1841). *Michael de Montaigne* [died 1592; his Essais, published by *L'Angelier*, Paris, 1595; best edition by *Pierre Coste*, 3, 4to., Lond., 1724; complete works, transl. by Hazlitt, Lond., 1849]; and *Pierre Charron* [his work of Wisdom, transl. by *Geo. Stanhope*, 2d ed., 2 vols., Lond., 1707] (died 1603), manifested a sceptical tendency; in later times, *Pierre Bayle* (died 1706) prepared the way for French Naturalism; concerning him see *L. Feuerbach*, Pierre Bayle, Anspach, 1838. [Bayle's Dict. transl. into English, 1710, 4 vols., fol., 1710; 5 fol., 1734–7; improved in the General Dictionary, 10 fol., 1741.] In Germany, *Matthias Knutsen* (who lived about the year 1674) founded the sect of the "Gewissener," *Conscientiarii*. [*F. W. Storch*, died 1704, De Concordia Rat. et Fidei. *J. K. Dippel*, died 1734, Christ. Democritus. *J. L. Schmidt*, died 1740, transl. Toland into German.]

[4] *Grotius* composed his apologetical work (§ 235, note 4) without reference to Deism. *Robert Boyle* (1638) endowed a series of lectures for the special purpose of opposing the English Deists. Among the English apologists, the most distinguished were *Richard Baxter* (died 1691), *William*

* The term "Deism," in particular, is not to be confounded with the same term as used by philosophers in distinction from Theism; for even Pantheism could ally itself with this tendency in its denial of Revelation.

† The author of the work Der Deutsche Protestantismus, justly calls attention to the preponderance of an idealistic and spiritualising philosophy, as a characteristic of the English Deism, and to its honorable moral earnestness, in contrast with the frivolity of the later French materialism.

Sherlock (died 1707), and others. On their polemical writings, in refutation of the Deists, see *Lechler*, l. c.; [see the next section]. Among the French apologists we may mention *Pascal* (see § 228, note 6), and *Abbadie*, a member of the Reformed Church (died 1727), who wrote: Traité de la Vérité de la Religion Chrétienne. Rotterd. 1684.

§ 238, *a*.

[THE ENGLISH DEISM.]

[Bp. *W. Van Mildert*, Rise and Progress of Infidelity; Boyle Lectures, 1802–4, 2 vols., Oxf., 1838.]

[Rationalism, in the form of Deism, was first systematically set forth in England. Its fundamental principle was, that reason is the source and measure of truth. Of Christianity, it adopted only those truths which could be considered as a product or republication of the light of nature; rejecting all that was miraculous, supernatural, or mysterious. Acknowledging a God, it denied a specific revelation. This tendency was evoked and stimulated in England not only by the conflicts of religious parties, and the prevalent freedom of thought and inquiry, but also by the force of reaction against the high church claims of the supremacy of a merely external authority, and by the progress of the empirical philosophy, as represented by some of the interpreters of *Bacon*[1] and *Locke*[2] and in the writings of *Hobbes*.[3] The first of the avowed Deists was *Edward Herbert, Lord Cherbury*,[4] who reduced religion to the most general truths of a system of natural ethics. *Charles Blount*,[5] was a follower of Hobbes. Locke's thesis of the Reasonableness of Christianity was perverted by *John Toland*[6] into the position that Christianity is not mysterious, admitting in the New Testament only what is comprehensible by reason. *Anthony Collins*,[7] continued the warfare in his Discourse on Free Thinking (1713), and his Discourse on the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion (1725), to which thirty-five replies were published. *Thomas Woolston*[8] attacked the Miracles of the Scripture (1727–30.) At the close of this period *Matthew Tindal*[9] gave a summary of the principles of Deism, in his Christianity as old as the Creation; or, the Gospel a Republication of the Religion of Nature. Somewhat later *Thomas Chubb*, and *Thomas Morgan* continued the succession of deistic writers,[10] which ended with *Lord Bolingbroke* (see § 275). Deism passed over into skepticism, the moral principles of the school were represented in a more refined form by *Anthony Ashley Cooper*,[11] Earl of Shaftsbury, and in a grosser manner by *Mandeville*,[12] in his Fable of the Bees, presented as a nuisance by the grand jury in 1723.]

[Among the ablest defenders of the Christian system against these assaults were, *Richard Bentley* in his Boyle Lectures, and in his reply to Collins; *Richard Baxter*, *S. Clarke*, *Sherlock*, in reply to Woolston; the dissenter, *James Foster*,[13] and *Bishop Stillingfleet*; *Bishop Butler* in his admirable Analogy, and many others.[14]]

[1] [*Francis Bacon*, Baron of Verulam, b. 1561, d. 1626. Works by *Basil Montagu*, 16 vols., Lond., 1825–34; new edition by Spedding and Ellis, Lond., 1857, *sq.*, reprinted, Boston, 1860, *sq.* (The Advancement of Learning, 1605; Essays, 1597–1624; Novum Organum, 1620; De Augmentis Scient., 1623). Comp. *Chs. de Remusat*, Bacon, sa Vie, sa Philosophie, etc., Paris, 1857. *Kuno Fischer*, Franz B. von Verulam; die Realphilosophie, Leipz., 1856, transl. by *Oxenford*, Lond., 1857. *G. L. Craik*, Bacon and his writings, new ed., 1860. *W. H. Dixon*, Personal Hist. of Lord B., Lond. and Bost., 1860. *De Maistre*, Bacon, 2 vols., Paris.—The philosophy of Bacon was expounded by the French school, in a spirit foreign to that of its author, applying its principles of induction to the supernatural as well as the natural sphere. Bacon made a broad distinction between the two, and he himself believed in the fundamental principles of the Christian faith; see his Literary and Professional Works, vol. 2. His real spirit is expressed in the petition contained in the Preface to the Instauratio Magna: "We suppliantly beseech, that things human may not injure things divine; and that nothing of darkness and unbelief, with reference to the divine mysteries, may arise in our minds from the unlocking of the road for the senses, and the greater enkindling of natural light."]

[2] [*John Locke*, b. 1632, d. 1704. Works, 3 fol., 1714, and often; 10th ed., Lond., 10 vols., 1801. Life, by *Lord King*, 2d ed., 2 vols., Lond., 1830. The principles of his Essay on the Human Understanding, were opposed by bp. Stillingfleet, 1697–99. His Reasonableness of Christianity gave the tone to the apologetic literature of the period. Comp. § 237, note 2.]

[3] [*Thomas Hobbes*, of Malmsbury, b. 1588, d. 1679. Works by Sir Wm. Molesworth, 16 vols., Lond., 1839–55. (Leviathan, 1651; Tripos; on Liberty and Necessity, 1654). He was opposed by *Cudworth*, in his Intel. System; by *Cumberland*, De Legibus Naturæ; by *Parker*, De Deo; by bp. *Bramhall*, on Necessity, and Catching the Leviathan, 1658; by abp. *Tenison*, 1670; by *Lord Clarendon*, in his Survey of the Leviathan. Though reckoned among the deists, his principles subverted the basis of morality as well as religion, substituting external authority for moral obligation. For the literature of his controversies, etc. see *Allibone*, Dict. of Authors. *Hobbes*, Lehre über Staat u. Kirche, by *Elster*, in Deutsche Zeitschrift, Aug., 1855.]

[4] [*Edward Herbert*, Lord Cherbury, b. 1851, d. 1648. De Veritate, Paris, 1624, Lond., 1633. De Religione Gentilium, Amst., 1663, in English, Lond., 1704. Life, written by himself, 1764. He reduced the truths of natural religion to five points: 1. Being of God; 2. Duty of Worship; 3. Virtue and piety; 4. Repentance; 5. Retribution in this world and the next. He was answered by *Locke*, *Baxter*, *Gassendi*, *Halyburton*, *Leland*; and by

Kortholt, De tribus impostoribus (Herbert, Hobbes, and Spinoza), Hamb., 1701.]

[5] [*Charles Blount*, b. 1654, committed suicide 1693. Anima Mundi, 1679; Religio Laici; Oracles of Reason, 1695. Life of Apollonius of Tyana, fol., Lond., 1680; a French version, 1775, 4 vols., Berlin. Replies by *Nicholls*, Conference with a Theist, 2 vols., 3d ed., 1723; *Van Mildert's* Boyle Lectures.]

[6] [*John Toland*, of Ireland, b. 1669, d. 1722. Christ. not Mysterious, Lond., 1696; an Apology for Mr. T. by himself, written the day before his book was resolved to be burnt by the Committee of Religion, 1697; Nazarenus, or Jewish, Gentile, and Mohamed. Christianity, 2d ed, 1718; Collection of Pieces, 2 vols., Lond., 1726. His Amyntor, or Defence of Milton's Life, 1699, was also designed to show that the canon of the New Test. is uncertain; replied to by *Samuel Clarke*, 1699, in *Richardson's* canon of New Test., and in *Jones'* New and Full Method of settling the Canonical Authority, 1726, 2, 8vo., a 3d vol., 1727. His Christ. not Mysterious was answered by *John Norris*, abp. *Synge*, of Tuam, and bp. *Browne*, of Cork. His Adeisidæmon sive Titus Livius, and Origines Judaicæ, were published at the Hague, 1709, and answered by *La Fave*, of Utrecht, in his Defensio Religionis, 1709, and *Benoit*, of Delft, in his Mélanges de Remarques critiques, etc., 1712.]

[7] [*Anthony Collins*, b. 1676, d. 1729: Essay on the Use of Reason, 1707; on Immortality, in the Dodwell Controversy, 1707–8; Priestcraft in Perfection, 1710; History of XXXIX. Articles, 1724 (*Bennett's* Essay in reply to the former book, 1815); Vindication of the Divine Attributes, 1710; Discourse on Freethinking, 1713—a French version, much altered, at the Hague, 1714. His work was replied to most conclusively by Dr. Bentley, in his Remarks upon a late Discourse on Freethinking, by Philaleutherus Lipsiensis, 1713, 1719, 1743, transl. into several tongues. Collins' Inquiry Concerning Liberty and Necessity, 1715–17 (in French, by Des Maizeaux, 2 vols., 1720). His discourse of the Ground and Reason of the Christ. Religion, 1724. This work was occasioned by Whiston's work on Prophecy, and Collins takes the ground, that prophecy is the principal evidence, but that no prophecy can be proved except by allegorical interpretations. His Scheme of Literal Prophecy, in defence, was published in 1727. This attack on prophecy made a great noise. In reply, bishop *Chandler*, 1725, A Defence of Christ. from the Prophecies; *Samuel Chandler*, Vindication, 1725; *Sykes*, on the Truth of Christ. Religion, 1725; *Whiston*, Supplement to the Literal Accomplishment, 1725; *Thos. Sherlock*, Use and Intent of Prophecy; *Moses Lowman*, Argument from Prophecy, 1733; Review of the Controversy, by *Thos. Jeffrey*, 1726, who also wrote Christ. the Perfection of all Religion, 1728.]

[8] [*Thomas Woolston*, b. 1669, d. 1733, next attacked the miracles, in his Discourses on the Miracles, 1727, for which he was sentenced to a year's imprisonment and a fine of one hundred pounds; the work reached a 6th ed., 1729; Defence, 2 Parts, 1729–30. He zealously advocated the allegorical interpretation, in opposition "to the ministry of the letter." Some twenty replies were published: bishop *Pearce*, of Rochester, Miracles Vind.,

1729; bp. *Smalbrook*, Vindication, 2 vols.; *Lardner's* Vind. of Three Miracles, 1729; particularly bp. *Sherlock*, Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection, 1729, 14 editions published (the French author, Peter Annet, attacked this 15 years afterwards); *Stackhouse*, State of the Controversy, 1730.]

[9] [*Matthew Tindal*, b. 1657, d. 1733; Rights of Christ. Church, and Defence, 1706–9; his Christ as Old as the Creation was published when he was 73 years old, in 1730, the ablest work in vindication of the perfection of natural religion. In reply, bp. *J. Conybeare*, Defence of Revealed Religion, 1732; *Thos. Burnet*, Conferences; *Waterland*, Script. Vindicated; *Law's* Case of Natural Religion; also *Stebbing*, *Balguy*, *Foster* (see below), and others. One of the ablest of these was *John Leland's* Answer, 2 vols., Dublin, 1733, Lond., 1740.]

[10] [*Thos. Morgan*, d. 1743; his chief work was, The Moral Philosopher, 3 vols., Lond., 1737, 2d ed., 1738, and Defence, in professed opposition to "Judaistic Christianity;" in reply, *J. Chapman*, Eusebius, the True Christian's Defence, 1739; *Leland*, Divine Authority of Old and New Test., 1739; *Lowman*, on Civil Government of Hebrews, 1740. The controversy was continued by the deistic tract Christianity not founded in Argument—replies by *Benson* and *Randolph;* and by another tract on the Resurrection of Jesus, answered by *West* and *Littleton* (see *Leland's* Deistical Writers, i. Letters, xi. xii.)—*Thomas Chubb*, b. 1679, d. 1747; the Previous Question with regard to Religion, 1725; Three Facts, 1727; Reason and Religion, 1731; Posthumous Works, 6 vols., 1754, etc.]

[11] [The Earl of *Shaftesbury*, b. 1671, d. 1713. The Moralist, 1709; Sensus Communis, 1710. His Characteristics, 3 vols., 1711–23, are intended to exalt virtue at the expense of revealed religion, making virtue its own reward, needing no religious sanctions. *John Brown*, Essays on the Characteristics, 1750; see also *Mackintosh*, Progress of Ethical Science, Memoirs of Shaftesbury, 2 vols., Lond., 1860.]

[12] [*Bernard Mandeville*, b. in Holland, 1670, removed to England, d. 1733. The Fable of the Bees; or, Private Vices Public Benefits, 2 vols., Lond., 1714. *William Law's* Remarks on the Fable of the Bees, with an Introd. by *F. D. Maurice*, Cambr., 1844. Bishop *Berkeley's* Minute Philosopher, written in Newport, R. I., and published 1732, was intended as a reply to Mandeville, whose opinions are there represented by *Lysicles*.]

[13] [Hon. *Robert Boyle*, son of Earl of Cork, b. 1626, d. 1691. Works, 6 vols., 4to. Lond., 1772, with Life by T. Bird. The Boyle Lecture Sermons were founded "to prove the truth of the Christian Religion against infidels, without descending to any controversies among Christians." A collection, from 1691 to 1732 was published in 1739, in 3 vols., folio. *Richard Bentley* (b. 1661, Regius Prof. Divin., Cambridge, 1716, d. 1742), gave the first course, a Confutation of Atheism; for his work against Collins, see Note 7, above; Bentley's works, by *A. Dyce*, 3 vols., 1856; life by *Bishop Monk*, Lond., 1830; Correspondence, 2 vols., 1842. *Samuel Clarke's* Demonstration of Being and Attributes of God, and his Sermons on Natural Religion were the Boyle Lectures for 1704–5; he also wrote in reply to Dodwell on Immortality, and to Toland's Amyntor.—*W. Whiston*, wrote in the same

series, 1707, on Scripture Prophecy.—*Richard Baxter* wrote on the Unreasonableness of Infidelity, and on Reasons for Christian Religion, against *Herbert*, etc. (Works, vols. 20, 21).—*James Foster*, b. 1697, d. 1753, published an able Defence of the Christian Religion, against Tindal; 3d ed., 1734.—On *Clarke*, see § 225, b., Note 51; on *Sherlock*, ib., Note 24; on *Whiston*, ib., Note 52.]

[13] [On *Stillingfleet*, comp. § 225, b., Note 24; his Origines Sacræ, or Rational Account of the Grounds of the Christian Religion, was publ fol., Cambr., 1701; 2, 8vo., Oxf., 1837.—*Joseph Butler*, bp. of Durham, b. at Wantage, Berkshire, 1692, Preacher at the Rolls, 1718, Bp. of Bristol, 1738, and of Durham, 1746, d. 1752. Works, new ed., Oxford, 2 vols., 1837, 1849, New York, 1844; with Life by *Samuel Halifax*, Bp. of Gloucester. His Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature, was published in 1733—rebutting the deistical arguments against revealed religion by their own concessions about natural religion. His correspondence, at the age of nineteen, with Dr. Clarke, on some of Clarke's arguments for the Being of God, exhibited great acuteness. His Sermons on Human Nature were said by Dr. Chalmers, to be "the most precious repository of sound ethical principles extant in any language." The Analogy has been frequently edited; in England by bp. *Wilson*, 7th ed. 1846, *Wilkinson*, 1847, *Angus*, 1855, *Steere*, 1857; in America by bp. *Hobart*, *Tefft*, *Albert Barnes*, *Emory* and *Crooks*, *Malcolm*. Among the other writers in this controversy were *Whitby*, Necessity of the Christian Religion (against Herbert), Lond., 1705; *Thos. Halyburton*, (b. 1674, Prof. Div. St. Andrews, 1710, d. 1712), Natural Religion Insufficient, 1714, against Herbert and Blount; *William Law* (b. 1686, a Non-juror, d. 1711), The Case of Reason, or Natural Religion fairly and fully stated, in reply to Tindal; *A. A. Sykes* (b. 1684, Prebend. Salisbury, 1723, d. 1736), Essay on the Truth of the Christ. Religion, against Collins, 1725; *Richard Smalbroke* (b. 1672, bp. of Lichfield, 1730, d. 1749), A Vindication of the Miracles of our blessed Saviour, in answer to Mr. Whiston, 2 vols., Lond., 1729–31—an able work; *Thos. Broughton* (b. 1704, d. 1774), Christianity distinct from the Religion of Nature, in reply to *Tindal*, 3 parts, 1732; *John Norris*, Reason and Faith in Relation to the Mysteries, Lond., 1697; *Chs. Leslie* (comp. § 225, *b.*), Short and Easy Method with Deists (works, 7 vols., 8vo., Oxf., 1832); *Peter Browne* (bp. of Cork and Rosse, d. 1735), Answer to Toland's Christ. not Mysterious, 1697; Procedure and Limits of Human Understanding (a Supplement to the above), 2d ed., 1729; *Simon Browne* (Dissenter, b. 1680, d. 1732), Defence of Religion of Nature, etc., against Tindal, Lond., 1732; Remarks on Woolston, 1732; *John Leland* (b. 1691, d. 1766), Remarks on *H. Dodwell's* Christianity not founded on Argument, 1744; Divine Authority of the Old and New Testament; Defence of Christianity, in Answer to Tindal; Advantage and Necessity of Christian Religion; View of the Principal Deistical Writers.]

§ 239.

DIVISION OF THE MATERIAL.

To facilitate the survey of the history of doctrines during the present period, it will be necessary to begin, in the special part of it, with those doctrines which most distinctly represent the doctrinal differences between the two greater ecclesiastical bodies—*i. e. the opposition between Roman Catholics and Protestants*[1]—and then pass over to *those* in which these sections of the church were more or less agreed (in contrast with the minor sects), and where the antithesis between *Romanism and Protestantism* either becomes of minor importance or entirely disappears. To the first class belong the doctrine concerning the sources of religious knowledge (which may be said to constitute the *formal* principle of Romanism and Protestantism); the doctrine respecting man, sin, justification, and redemption (in which the so-called *material* principle of Protestantism and Romanism respectively, is brought out); and lastly, those doctrines which most clearly display the logical consequences of both these principles—viz. the doctrines of the church,[2] of the sacraments (with the exception of baptism), and of purgatory (which forms a part of eschatology).[3] To the second class belong theology proper, and christology, the doctrine of baptism, and eschatology (with the exception of purgatory).

[1] Here, too, we must have constant regard to the subordinate antagonism between the Lutherans and the Reformed (Calvinists), which first came out in the doctrine respecting the Lord's Supper, afterwards in the doctrine of predestination, and was also exhibited on other points, without however involving on either side an abandonment of the common ground of Evangelical Protestantism in its fundamental principles. Here, too, may be considered the deviating views of the lesser religious parties, somewhat receding from the general Protestant principles, so far as they bear upon those doctrinal points.

[2] The doctrine concerning the church also belongs, in a certain aspect, among the fundamental controverted points, especially in the Roman Catholic point of view; see the treatise of *Baur* in answer to *Möhler's* Symbolik, p. 60, ss. But the views of Protestants concerning the church resulted rather from their principles on other points.

[3] It has, indeed, its inconveniences, thus to separate the different points embraced in the *locus* about the sacraments, and in eschatology; but the advantage is found in presenting *Symbolism* in its true and natural relation to the whole *History of Doctrines*, thus facilitating a general view of the antagonistic positions. In the doctrines that have respect to Theology, and Christology, and in the doctrine respecting Baptism, come up the chief points of opposition between the larger churches and the sects (Unitarians, Anabaptists).

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FOURTH PERIOD.

FIRST CLASS.

THE CHARACTERISTIC DOCTRINES OF ROMANISM AND PROTESTANTISM.

(INCLUDING THE OPPOSITION BETWEEN LUTHERANS AND CALVINISTS, AND THE OPINIONS OF THE MINOR RELIGIOUS PARTIES AND SECTS.)

FIRST DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINES CONCERNING THE SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE.

(THE FORMAL PRINCIPLE).

FORMAL PRINCIPLE.

§ 240.

ROMANISM AND PROTESTANTISM.

Heppe, Die Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus. [Comp. the works referred to, vol. i., p. 42. *W. O. Dietlein*, Vorträge über Protest. und Katholicismus, Halle, 1854. *Schenkel*, Das Princip. des Protestantismus, 1852. *Twesten*, Protest. und Kathol. in his Dogmatik, i. *Bp. Edmond Gibson*, Preservative against Popery, 18 vols., Lond. 1848–9, and Supplement, 8 vols., 1849, contains many of the leading English treatises on the points of difference. *D. Schenkel*, Ursprüngliches Verhältniss der Kirche zum Kanon, Basel, 1838. *William Goode*, Divine Rule, repr. Phil., 2 vols., 1848. *Richard Baxter*, Key for Catholicy, 1659; Roman Tradition Examined, 1676. *E. B. Pusey*, Rule of Faith as maintained by the Fathers of the Church of England.]

From the commencement of the Reformation it became evident, in the course of the struggle, that its adherents proceeded upon a different *formal* principle (as to the source of knowledge, and rule of faith), from that held by the Roman Church of that period. For

while the advocates of the Romish Church continually appealed to the authority of tradition, the Protestants refused to yield to any arguments but those clearly drawn from Scripture.[1] This primitive difference was prominently brought forward in the symbolical books in general, and in those of the Reformed Church in particular.[2] It may be specified in the four following particulars; 1. While the Protestant Church asserts that the sacred writings of the Old and New Testaments are the only sure source of religious knowledge, and constitute the sole rule of faith,[3] the Roman Catholic Church assumes the existence of another source together with the Bible—viz. tradition.[4] 2. Acording to Protestants, the Holy Bible is composed only of the canonical writings of the Old and New Testament,[5] while the Roman Catholics also ascribe canonical authority to the so-called Apocrypha of the Old Testament.[6] 3. The Roman Catholic Church claims the sole right of interpreting the Scripture,[7] while the Protestant church concedes this right in a stricter sense, to every one who possesses the requisite gifts and attainments, but in a more comprehensive sense to every Christian who seeks after salvation; it proceeds upon the principle, that Scripture is its own interpreter, according to the *analogia fidei*.[8] With this is connected, in the *fourth* place, the assumption of the Roman Catholic Church, that the Vulgate version, which it sanctions, is to be preferred to all other versions, as the authentic one, and is thus to a certain extent of equal importance with the original,[9] while Protestants regard the original only as authentic.[10]

[1] *Luther* was led to his view about the Scriptures, as the only rule of faith, from his views about justification; he came to the *formal* by means of the *material* principle. Contending against the false doctrine of justification, as seen in relation to the sale of indulgences, he first of all appealed to the Pope; then from the Pope ill instructed, to the Pope better instructed; then to a council; until at last he recognized the authority of Scripture as alone decisive; and elevated this to the rank of a formal principle. Even in his Protestation at the end of his Theses, he says, that he is not so presumptuous as to prefer his opinion to the opinion of all; but also, that he is not so thoughtless as to put the *Divine Word* below *fables of human invention* (Werke, Walch's edition, xviii., 254 sq.). He is more definite at the Leipsic Disputation (*ibid.*, p. 1160), saying, that no Christian can be forced to bind himself to *aught but the Holy Scriptures, which alone have divine right.* In his *Resolutiones*, he rises distinctly above the authority of councils. Compare his other controversial works, and his position at the Diet of Worms; see, further, *Schenkel*, Das Wesen des Protest., i., 20 sq. [*Gieseler*, Church Hist., New York ed., vol. v., § 34.] What Luther thus attained unto was further developed by Melancthon: Loci Theol., ed. *Augusti*, p. 4 sq. Imo nihil perinde optarim, atque si fieri possit, Christianos, omnes in solis divinis litteris liberrime versari et in illarum indolem plane transformari. Nam cum

in illis absolutissimum sui imaginem expresserit divinitas, non poterit aliunde neque certius neque purius cognosci. Fallitur quisquis aliunde Christianismi formam petit, quam e Scriptura canonica. Comp. also the passages in the later editions, in *Bretschscider*, Corpus Reform., xxi, p. 453, 685 sq., 732. On the distinction which he makes between Scripture and the word of God, see *Heppe*, u. s., p. 216.—*Zwingle* came more speedily than Luther to a clear view of the Scriptures as a rule of faith, although he did not at first emphasize Scripture *as such*, but the *Word of God* in contrast with the *doctrines of man*. Thus, in his treatise "Von der Klarheit und Gwüsse des göttlichen Wortes" (Werke, i., 81), he says: "In fine, that we may stop having to give an answer to every body about all sorts of objections, this is our view, that the Word of God must be held by us in the highest honor (by Word of God meaning only what comes from the Spirit of God), and that to no word should be given such faith as to that. For this word is certain, cannot fail; it is clear, and will not let us wander in darkness; it teaches itself, expounds itself, and makes the human soul to shine with all salvation and grace," etc. See, too, his declarations at both of the Zurich Disputations. He speaks of the Scripture itself first in his Architeles (Opera iii.; see *Ebrard*, Abendmahlslehre, ii. 46, *sq.*). Thus on p. 32: Scripturam sacram ducem et magistram esse oportet, qua si quis recte usus sit, impunem esse oportet, etiamsi doctorculis maxime displiceat. And here the highest rule is what Christ teaches, *ibid.*, p. 30; Cunctis post habitis huc tandem veni, ut nulla re, nullo sermone tam fiderem, atque eo, qui ex ore Domini prodiit. Pag. 31: Dum lapidem inquiro, non invenio alium, quam lapidem offensionis et petram scandali, ad quam offendunt, quotquot Pharisæorum more irritum faciunt præceptum Dei propter traditionem suam. His itaque in hunc modum comparatis, cœpi omnem doctrinam ad hunc lapidem explorare, et si vidissem lapidem eundem reddere colorem vel potius doctrinam ferre posse lapidis claritatem, recipi eam; sin minus, rejeci.... Ad hunc thesaurum, puta ad certitudinem verbi Dei, dirigendum est cor nostrum.—And in his Expositio Simplex (Opera, iv. p. 67): Non vel jota unum docemus, quod non ex divinis oraculis didicerimus, neque sententiam ullam, cujus non primarios ecclesiæ doctores, prophetas, apostolos, evangelistas, episcopos, interpretes, sed priscos illos, qui purius ex fonte hauserunt, auctores habeamus. (That is, he urges in respect to Scripture, the idea of its original and primitive authority.) Moreover, according to Zwingle, "Scripture can be understood only through and by faith, and faith be confirmed, as to its being right, only by the Scripture, which is rightly understood by faith." (The Analogia fidei. He gives as an illustration, the case of one, who should try to put a horse to a cart without harness or lines, or to draw the cart with ropes without the horse; both belong together—German Works, ii. 2, p. 3).—The principle about Scripture is more abstractly presented by *Calvin*, Instit. I. c. 6, § 2: Sic autem habendum est, ut nobis affulgeat vera religio, exordium a cœlesti doctrina fieri debere, nec quemquam posse vel minimum gustum rectæ sanæque doctrinæ percipere, nisi qui *Scripturæ* fuerit discipulus. Unde etiam emergit veræ intelligentiæ principium, ubi reverenter amplectimur, quod de se illic testari Deus voluit. (Compare what he says in the context of this chapter, and in the subsequent chapters.)

[2] The Lutheran symbols do not contain any separate article de Sacra Scriptura, but occasionally oppose tradition. Comp. Confess. August., p. 13, 28 ss. Apolog., p. 205 ss. Articles of Smalcald, p. 337. The Form. Concord. is more definite, p. 570. On the other hand, the symbols of the Reformed Church, for the most part, commence with the article de Sacra Scriptura, or have a special article elsewhere (see the next note). The only exception is the first Confession of Basle, which, nevertheless, concludes with a submission of all its articles to the authority of Scripture. Compare note 3.

[3] Articles of Smalcald, l. c.: Regulam autem aliam habemus, ut videli et *verbum Dei* condat articulos fidei et præterea nemo, ne angelus quidem. Form. Conc., l. c.: Credimus...unicam regulam et normam, secundum quam omnia dogmata omnesque doctores æstimari et judicari oporteat, nullam omnino aliam esse, quam prophetica et apostolica scripta cum V. tum N. T. Reliqua vero sive patrum sive neotericorum scripta, quocunque veniant nomine, sacris litteris nequaquam sunt æquiparanda. Comp. Sol. Decl., p. 632.—Conf. Helv., I. (Bas. II.): Scriptura canonica verbum Dei, Spiritu S. tradita, *omnium perfectissima et antiquissima philosophia*, pietatem omnem, omnem vitæ rationem, sola perfecte continet.—Helv., II., 1: In Scriptura sancta habet universalis Christiana ecclesia plenissime exposita, quæcunque pertinent cum ad salvificam fidem tum ad vitam Deo placentem recte informandam ... Sentimus ergo ex hisce scripturis petendam esse veram sapientiam et pietatem, ecclesiarum quoque reformationem et gubernationem omniumque officiorum pietatis institutionem, probationem denique dogmatum reprobationemque aut errorum confutationem omnium, sed admonitiones omnes.* Cap. 2: Non alium sustinemus in causa fidei judicem, quam ipsum Deum per Script. S. pronunciantem, quid verum sit, quid falsum, quid sequendum sit, quidve fugiendum.—Repudiamus traditiones humanas, quæ tametsi insigniantur speciosis titulis, quasi divinæ apostolicæque sint, viva voce apostolorem et ceu per manus virorum apostolicorum succedentibus episcopis ecclesiæ traditæ, compositæ tamen cum scripturis ab his discrepant, discrepantiaque illa sua ostendunt, se minime esse apostolicas. Sicut enim Apostoli inter se diversa non docuerunt, ita et apostolici non contraria apostolis ediderunt. Quinimo impium esset asseverare, apostolos vive voce contraria scriptis suis tradidisse.—Comp., Conf. Gall., Art. 5; Belg. 7; Angl. 6; Scot. 18, etc., quoted by *Winer*, pp. 30, 31. The Remonstrants and Socinians agreed with the Protestants in this general formal principle. See Conf. Remonstr., i. 10 ss., i. 13; Cat. Racov., Qu. 31 and 33, quoted by *Winer*, pp. 31, 32. Concerning the sense in which Protestants take *tradition*, see below (§ 241).† That the same importance should afterwards be

* The Confession, however, grants, that God *can* enlighten man on extraordinary cases, even without the preaching of the word: Agnoscimus interim, Deum illuminare posse homines, etiam sine externo ministerio, quos et quando velit; id quod ejus potentiæ est. Nos autem loquimur de usitata ratione instituendi homines, et præcepto et exemplo tradita nobis a Deo.

† In reference to *external rites* (which are transmitted to us by tradition) the Conf. Angl., says, Art. 34: Traditiones atque ceremonias easdem, non omnino necessarium est esse ubique, aut prorsus consimiles. Nam ut variæ semper fuerunt, et mutari possunt, pro regionum, temporum et morum diversitate, *modo nihil contra verbum Dei instituatur.*

assigned to the symbolical writings of the Protestant Churches, which was formerly ascribed to tradition (Form. Cons., Helv. 26), was not the intention of their original authors; see the conclusion of the first Confession of Basle; "And lastly, we submit this our confession to the authority of Holy Writ, and are willing to render grateful obedience to God and his Holy Word, whenever we shall be better instructed therefrom." Comp. Confess. Helv. II., and Confess. Scot. at the close of the preface.

[4] Conc. Trid., sess. IV., (de Canon. Scripturis): Synodus.....hoc sibi perpetuo ante oculos proponens, ut sublatis erroribus puritas ipsa evangelii in ecclesia conservetur....perspiciensque veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis *et sine scripto traditionibus*, quæ ex ipsius Christi ore ab apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsius apostolis *Spiritu Sancto dictante*, *quasi per manus traditæ*, ad nos usque pervenerunt: orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam V. quam N. T. cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, *necnon traditiones ipsas*, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tamquam vel oretenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas et continua successione in ecclesia catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur.....Si quis autem.....traditiones prædictas sciens et prudens contemserit, anathema sit. Comp. Cat. Rom. præf. 12; and on the nature of tradition, see the passages from *Bellarmine* De Verbo Dei iv. 3, quoted by *Winer*, pp. 30 and 31. [See also *Köllner*, Symbolik, ii. 342-354.] *Cani* Loci Theolog. 3. The doctrine of the Greek Church is similar, Confess. orthod. p. 18: *Φανερὸν πῶς τὰ ἄρθρα τῆς πίστεως ἔχουσι τὸ κῦρος καὶ τὴν δοκιμασίαν, μέρος ἀπὸ τὴν ἁγίαν γραφὴν, μέρος ἀπὸ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν.*

[5] Compare the passage in note 3, and what is said of the *quam prophetica* et *apostolica* scripta cum V. tum N. T.—The Apocrypha was more distinctly rejected in the symbols of the Reformed Churches, as well as in those of the Arminians, Mennonites, and Socinians. Confess. Helv. II. 1. Gall. 3, 4. Confess. Belg. 6. Confess. Remonstr. i. 6. (*Winer*, p. 41). Some confessions of faith even contain lists of the canonical writings, *e. g.*, Conf. Angl. 6; Belg. Art. 4. (But the free examination of the canon was thus prevented or limited.)

[6] Conc. Trid. sess. IV. Decret. 1.—Respecting the reasons by which the Roman Catholic Church may have been induced to ascribe so much importance to the Apocrypha (which indeed contained proofs of some of its doctrines, but with which it could dispense in consequence of the authority ascribed to tradition), see *Marheineke*, Symb. vol. ii. p. 234, ss. *Winer*, p. 41. [Köllner, Symbolik, ii. 346–8.]

[7] Conc. Trid. sess. IV., decret. de Edit. et Usu S. S.: Ad coërcenda petulantia ingenia decernit (Synodus), ut nemo suæ prudentiæ innixus, in rebus

Traditiones et ceremonias ecclesiasticas, *quæ cum verbo Dei non pugnant*, et sunt auctoritate publica institutæ atque probatæ, quisquis privato consilio volens, et data opera, publice violaverit, is, ut qui peccat in publicum ordinem ecclesiæ, quique læ lit auctoritatem magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias vulnerat, publice, ut cæteri timeant, arguendus est. Quælibet ecclesia particularis, sive nationalis, auctoritatem habet instituendi, mutandi, aut abrogandi ceremonias, aut ritus ecclesiasticos, *humana tantum auctoritate institutos*, modo omnia ad ædificationem fiant.

fidei et morum ad ædificationem doctrinæ christianæ pertinentium, sacram scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, *cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum Sanctarum*, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum patrum ipsam scripturam sacram interpretari audeat, etiamsi hujusmodi interpretationes nullo unquam tempore in lucem edendæ forent. Qui contravenerint, per ordinarios declarentur et pœnis a jure statutis puniantur. The particular comment is given by *Bellarmine*, De Verbo Dei, iii. 3. The principal question is, where the Spirit is to be found, to which he of course replies, in the church. When differences arise (which were foreseen by God), there must be some authority to decide. But this can be neither the Sacred Scriptures, nor a revelation made to an individual, nor the secular power. Accordingly, no other authority remains than the princeps ecclesiasticus, *i. e.* the pope, either alone or in connection with the bishops. Scripture, like a law, admits of several interpretations. In every well-ordered state the power of legislation and the power of jurisdiction are two different things. The law commands, the judge interprets the law, therefore Scripture cannot be its own interpreter. Yet neither pope nor council interpret arbitrarily, but according to Divine inspiration. Comp. *J. Gretseri* Tractat. Unde Scis, hunc vel illum esse sincerum et legitimum Scripturæ Sensum.—*Cani* Loci Theolog. lib. iv. *Becani* Manuale i. 5.—The Greeks agree with the Roman Catholics as regards the general principle of the authority of the church, but limit it to the œcumenical councils. See the passages in *Winer*, pp. 35, 36. *Klausen*, Hermeneutik, p. 286, ss.

[8] As early as the time in which the various disputations with the Roman Catholics took place, the Reformers claimed the right of free interpretation of Scripture, *i. e.*, an interpretation independent of the councils. Comp. Zwingle, Von der Klarheit des Wortes Gottes (deutsche Schriften, i. p. 76, ss.); also his Antwort an Val. Compar. (ibid. i. 2, p. 9, *sq.*) *Calvin*, Instit. i. 7, 8. Here again the symbols of the Reformed Churches express themselves in more definite language than those of the Lutheran Church (*Winer*, l. c.) Confess. Helv. I. (II. Confess. of Basle) Art. 2 : Scripturæ Sacræ interpretatio ex ipsa sola petenda est, ut ipsa interpres sit sui, caritatis fideique regula moderante.—Conf. Helv. II. c. 2 : Scripturas sanctus dixit Ap. Petrus (2 Petr. i. 20), non esse interpretationis privatæ. Proinde non probamus interpretationes quaslibet : unde nec pro vera aut genuina scripturarum interpretatione agnoscimus eum, quem vocant sensum romanæ ecclesiæ, quem scilicet simpliciter romanæ ecclesiæ defensores omnibus obtrudere contendunt recipiendum. Sed illam duntaxat scripturarum interpretationem pro orthodoxa et genuina agnoscimus, quæ ex ipsis est petita scripturis (ex ingenio utique *ejus linguæ, in qua sunt scriptæ*, secundum circumstantias item expensæ et pro ratione locorum vel similium vel dissimilium plurium quoque et clariorum expositæ) cum regula fidei et caritatis congruit et ad gloriam Dei hominumque salutem eximie facit. Comp. Conf. Scot. 18. Conf. Remonstr. i. 14.—The *Socinians* distinctly avowed the same principle in agreement with the orthodox Protestants. Cat. Racov. Qu. 36 : Etsi difficultates quædem in S. S. occurrunt, tamen multa alia, tum ea, quæ sunt ad salutem necessaria, ita perspicue aliis in locis S. S. sunt tradita, ut ab uno-

quoque, *maxime vero pietatis ac veritatis studioso et divinam opem implorante*, possint intelligi.—It is also to be observed, that the Protestants fully recognized the distinction, on the one hand, between the learned interpretation and the general common-sense understanding of the Scripture, and on the other, between such a general understanding and the *more profound insight* into the meaning of Scripture, which is granted to none but the regenerate. Comp. the extracts from Luther's works given by Walch, ix. p. 857. "*Analogia fidei and the aid of the Holy Spirit were acknowledged as the guides in interpreting Scripture.*" *Winer*, p. 37. On the principles of interpretation adopted by the Reformers, see *Schenkel*, ubi supra, i. 67, *sq.*—In respect to the obscure passages of Scripture, Luther says (Walch, xviii.): "Let it go where it is dark; hold to it where it is clear."—"To interpret and illustrate Scripture by Scripture," was his hermeneutical canon, and that of the Reformers, which they carried out in a practical way. Comp. *Zwingle*, in Note 1, above.

[9] Conc. Trid. sess. 4: Synodus, considerans non parum utilitatis accedere posse ecclesiæ Dei, si ex omnibus latinis editionibus, quæ circumferuntur, sacrorum librorum, quænam pro authentica habenda sit, innotescat, statuit et declarat, ut hæc ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quæ longo tot sæculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus et expositionibus pro *authentica* habeatur et ut nemo eam rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat. Respecting the meaning of the passage, see *Winer*, p. 39, and the passages quoted by him from *Bellarmine*, and the doctrinal writers of the Roman Catholic Church; *Schröckh*, Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation, IV. p. 132, ss.; *Marheineke*, Symb. ii. p. 241, ss.—This canon shows, that its authors not only ascribed minor importance to the original, but were also virtually opposed to translations into modern languages (inasmuch as even the texts of sermons are to be selected from the Vulgate), and also to their circulation among the laity. Comp. *Winer*, p. 40. [*Köllner*, ubi supra.]

[10] The Confess. Helv. II. 2, has a reference to the original (comp. note 8). In accordance with their principles of interpretation, the Protestants asserted that a more precise scientific study of the Sacred Scriptures is impossible, without the knowledge of the original languages; accordingly *exegesis*, founded upon solid philological studies, forms among Protestants the basis of the study of theology. On the other hand, they determined as definitely, that a version, as faithful as possible to the original, was sufficient for practical purposes. But it never would have occurred to them to select among these translations *one* (*e. g.* that of Luther), and designate it as as the only authentic one; though many have, to the present day, hesitated to enlighten the people on the differences sometimes existing between the translation and the original. But is this Protestant?

§ 241.

DIVERGENT VIEWS OF SOME SECTS.

A. The Mystical Principle.

The Protestants maintained the authority of Scripture, not only in opposition to the Roman Catholic doctrine of tradition, but also to the mystical principle, which insists upon the *internal* word, at the expense of the external. Among the advocates of the latter were included, not only the Anabaptists, who, besides holding stiffly to the letter of Scripture,[1] also appealed after the manner of the Montanists, to new revelations ;[2] but also others, who insisted upon the insufficiency of the external word, agreeing more or less with the the Anabaptists. Among them were *Sebastian Frank*,[3] *Caspar Schwenckfeld*,[4] *Theobald Thamer*,[5] and *Michael Servetus*.[6] In essential agreement with them were the *Quakers*,[7] as well as the followers of *Labadie*,[8] who attached great importance to internal revelation, as that by which the external revelation is rendered intelligible, and from which it receives its authority. From the negative point of view, these sects supposed, like the Roman Catholics, the existence of another authority *in addition* to that of Scripture, or rather *above* it ; positively, they differed more widely from Romanism than did Protestants, by rejecting every objective authority, and appealing to nothing but subjective experience, mere internal feeling. Thus the Protestant doctrine of the authority of Scripture occupies an intermediate position between the ecclesiastical objectivity of Romanism, and the mystical subjectivity of Separatism.

[1] Even Carlstadt was stiff upon the letter of Scripture; see *Schenkel*, i. 40, *sq.* On his earlier, and more prudent view, see the work, De Canonicis Scripturis Libellus D. Andreæ Bodenstein Carolstadii, etc., Witenb., 1529; and *Erbkam*, Prot. Secten, 189. The opposition of the Zwickau people to infant baptism is also to be explained in part as an exaggeration of the formal principle of Protestantism. On the literalness of the Swiss Anabaptists, particularly *Hubmeier*, and the polemics of Zwingle against them, see *Bullinger*, in *Schenkel*, i. 47, *sq.* Zwingle wrote his Elenchus against them (Opera, iii. p. 367).

[2] *Planck*, ubi supra, p. 44. They were, on the one hand, extremely literal, and yet they insisted strongly, on the other hand, upon the difference of the letter and the spirit (according to 2 Cor. iii. 6). Comp. *Calvin* in his Institutes, I. 9. How Luther, and the Reformers, regarded their visions and new revelations is well known; see *e. g.*, Luther's letter to Melancthon in *De Wette's* Briefe Luthers, ii. No. 358; compare the views

of *John Denck*, and *Hetzer*, cited in *Schenkel*, i. 143. *Hagen*, Geist der Reform. ii. 282. The later and more prudent Mennonites returned to Scripture.

[3] *Sebastian Frank*, in his work, "Das verbütschirte, mit sieben Siegeln verschlossene Buch," tries to show that the literal interpretation of Scripture involves us in inextricable contradictions; "God means to use the Scripture to drive us to the Scripture, and make us anxious and fearful thereby, so that we may be forced out of the Scripture back again to and into *him*, and hasten to ask counsel of *his* mouth and Spirit," etc. "The Scripture," he says, "is both good and evil, clear and obscure, according to the mode in which we take it in hand; to the perverse, it is evil and dark. Therefore the Holy Spirit will not permit us to be satisfied with the Scripture, or to make an idol of it, as if we always stood in need of it; but sends us to inquire of Him for the right understanding and interpretation of it." See his tract, Wie alle Ding vor in der Natur sind (in *Schenkel*, i. 140).—Even the devil can be very Scriptural, yea, even put himself into the midst of the letters of Scripture, as he has already done by so many sects, who have nothing but vain Scripture on their side." (Preface to his Zeitbuch). "The Scripture-learnt devil makes anything and everything out of Scripture." See Paradoxa, p. 134 (in *Schenkel*, ubi supra. *Hagen*, p. 436, *sq.* *Erbkam*, 295, *sq.*).

[4] He wrote: De Cursu Verbi Dei, edit. *J. Œcolampadius*, Bas., 1527. Schwenkfeld maintained in this work, that faith does not proceed from external things, such as the external revelation of hearing, but from the internal revelation, which must be antecedent to the ministration of the external. Abraham believed without sermon and without hearing. The letter is only the vessel of the Spirit: they should not be confounded with each other. Schwenkfeld also made a parallel between the Bible and nature (comp. Raimund of Sabunde). The whole world is to him "a great book, all glorious with paintings and descriptions, in many sorts of letters, of the works of God." These works are "living letters," which men ever have before their eyes; they are the genuine "peasants' calendar," the real "lay Bible," in which those can read who do not understand any other kinds of writings. Hence Christ points to the birds of heaven and the lilies of the valley. See *Schenkel*, ubi supra, p. 150. Yet Schwenkfeld did not take a position hostile to the Bible; it was to him the test by which to try all divine revelation. Comp. *Erbkam*, 425, *sq.*

[5] On him see *Neander's* tract, Theobald Thamer, the Representative and Forerunner of Modern Spiritualistic Tendencies in the Times of the Reformation, Berlin, 1842.—*Thamer* was accustomed not to read the gospel text in the pulpit, but to recite it without book, "because a real evangelical preacher ought not only to learn the dead letter, but *to be a Bible* in his works, prayers, and life." *Neander*, p. 21. He accused Luther and his disciples of deifying the letter of the Bible: "When any one asks thee, how thou knowest that these texts are the gospel? thou repliest by bringing forward a perverted witness, the Scripture and the letter, written on paper with ink, which in itself is as good as dumb, and answers thee in a dead language, which thou dost not understand. The human, yea Jewish and

perverted sense, thou not only holdest to be higher than *conscience, which is the revealed deity itself*,* and than all God's creatures and works, but thou also makest it to be the queen of all saints and angels in heaven." "Anything is not true because it stands in the Bible, but it is in the Bible because it is true of itself;" see *Neander*, 24; *Schenkel*, i. 144, *sq.* Like Schwenkfeld, he also appeals to the revelations in nature, and accuses his opponents of Manicheeism; comp. *Neander*, p. 31.—[On Thamer, compare also Theobald Thamer und Landgraf Philip, by *K. W. H. Hochhuth*, in Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol., 1861, s. 165–280: his various works, pp. 166–8. Comp. *Neander*, Hist. Dogmas, p. 631; *Niedner*, 678; *Pestalozzi's* Bullinger, s. 461, *sq.* Thamer studied in Wittenberg, 1535, was Prof. in Marburg, 1543, died 1569.]

[6] *Servetus*, too, distinguishes in Scripture the external and the internal word; and in this sense, it is to him a two-edged sword. He also shows how Christianity is older than the Scripture (the New Test.). See his Christianismi Restitutio, p. 627; Illud verum est quod sine Scripturis stare potest ecclesia Christi vera, et erat ecclesia Christi, antequam apostoli scriberent. Ecclesiæ prophetia, interpretatio et vox viva præfertur Scripturæ mortuæ *Schenkel*, ubi supra.

[7] Barclaii Apol. thes. 2. . . . . Divinæ revelationes internæ, quas ad fundendam veram fidem absolute necessarias esse adstruimus, externo scripturarum testimonio aut sanæ ratione ut nec contradicunt, ita nec unquam contradicere possunt. Non tamen inde sequitur, quod hæ revelationes divinæ ad externum scripturarum testimonium aut etiam ad rationem naturalem seu humanam,† tamquam ad nobiliorem aut certiorem normam et amussim, examinari debeant. Nam divina revelatio et illuminatio interna est quiddam per se evidens et clarum, intellectum bene dispositum propria evidentia et claritate cogens ad assentiendum, atque insuperabiliter movens et flectens non minus, quam principia communia veritatum naturalium (cujusmodi sunt: totum est majus sua parte; duo contradictoria non possunt esse simul vera aut falsa) movent flectuntque animum ad assensum naturalem. Comp. the commentary to this thesis in *Winer*, p. 53. On the principle of interpretation, see Apol. x. 19, p. 198: Quidquid homo sua industria in linguis et eruditione in scripturis inveniere potest, totum nihil est sine spiritu, absque quo nihil certum, semper fallibile judicatum est. Sed vir rusticus, hujusque eruditionis ignarus, qui ne vel elementum norit, quando scripturam lectam audit, eodem spiritu hoc esse verum dicere potest et

* In another place, Thamer calls conscience the true living throne of grace, "where we ask God how and what we ought to do or leave undone. One may hear the external Scripture for a thousand years, and if he has not within him the living word, the divinity of Christ or the conscience, it is to him no word at all." *Neander*, p. 28. Thamer tried to ridicule the orthodox idea of inspiration: "They imagine it to have been like this, that God sat there with a great beard, as the painters represent him on the wall, and took up a word with his hand, *i. e.*, a sound, and put it on the tongue of Jeremiah," etc. *Neander*, 26.

† His principle is therefore not to be confounded with that of the Rationalists. Barclay places the internal revelation alike above reason and Scripture (mystical supranaturalism.)

eodem spiritu intelligere, et si necesse sit, interpretari potest.—iii. 4, p. 44. .....Nullus adeo illitteratus, surdus aut tam remoto loco positus est, quem non attingat et recte instruat; cujus etiam spiritus evidentia et revelatio ea sola est, qua difficultatibus illis, quæ de scripturis occurrunt, liberamur.

[8] Though the sacred Scriptures contain truth, they are not themselves the truth, but God and Jesus Christ are that truth. Properly speaking, the Bible itself does not give eternal life, but God, who is life, works it in us. ....—We are to believe the mouth, *i. e.*, the Holy Spirit, who still speaks to us, rather than the pen of the writers whom he employed. Divine truth is infinite, nor can it be restricted to any letter; therefore there may be many truths which are divine truths, without being strictly contained in Scripture, and which to reject merely because they are not found in Scripture, would be sinful. We are not to believe a doctrine because it is *written*, but because it *comes from God*. (In contrast with a degenerate adherence to the letter in later times, such views are worthy of notice.) See *Arnold*, Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, vol. ii. p. 687. (Frankf. edit., 1700.)

[9] In common with the Roman Catholic Church, and in opposition to the principle adopted by the Quakers, Protestants assert the necessity of having something *positive*, which is objectively *given*, but find it in Scripture alone and not in the authority of the church. In common with the Quakers, and in opposition to Roman Catholics, they are anti-catholic, rejecting the authority of the church. Thus the Quakers will regard the historico-positive tendency of Protestantism as a catholic element, while Roman Catholics will charge that principle with fomenting divisions, because of its internal and subjective character.

§ 242.

B. THE RATIONALISTIC PRINCIPLE. (SOCINIANS.)

Protestants not only rejected these mystical notions, but also the rationalistic principle, according to which the authority of Scripture is subordinate to that of reason, and its interpretation made to depend on the so-called truths of reason.[1] Such a doctrine was propounded by the Socinians, who acknowledged the necessity of an external revelation,[2] and the authority of the Bible, though in the first instance, only of the New Testament,[3] but, proceeding upon the fundamental principle, that Scripture can not contain anything that is either incomprehensible or contrary to reason (*i. e.* to the reason of Socinians),[4] were, in many cases, induced to adopt the most arbitrary interpretations.[5]

[1] Luther in several passages expressed himself against reason, considering it to be blind in spiritual things.

[2] *Faustus Socinus* went so far as to assert the the impossibility of a mere

religion of reason without a higher revelation. Opp. ii. p. 454, a.: Homo ipse per se nec se ipsum nec Deum ejusque voluntatem cognoscere potest, sed necesse est, ut hæc illi Deus aliqua ratione patefaciat. Comp. Prælect. Theol. c. 2. *Ostorodt*, Unterr. p. 10: "Men, however, do not derive their knowledge of God, or of divine things, either from nature, or from the contemplation of the works of creation, but from tradition, since God has from the beginning revealed himself to them. Those who have not at all heard of him, are not likely to have any opinion about any one Deity." The later Socinians departed more or less from these strict supernatural views.*

[3] Respecting the views of Socinus and his followers about the sacred Scriptures, see the subsequent §§, and *Fock's* Socianismus. The Socinians, however, received only the New Test. as canonical; see Catech. Racov. p. 1, and Socinus, De Auctor. S. S. c. 1, p. 271, quoted by *Winer*, pp. 32, 33. In his opinion the Old Test. has only a historical value, but its dogmatic and religious importance is not greater than that which other Protestants ascribe to the Apocrypha. It is *useful*, but not *necessary* to be read.

[4] *Schlichting*, Diss. de. Trin. p. 70: Mysteria divina non idcirco mysteria dicuntur, quod etiam revelata omnem nostrum intellectum captumve transcendunt, sed quod nonnisi ex revelatione div. cognosci possunt. Comp. *C. Zerrenner*, neuer Versuch zur Bestimmung der dogmatischen Grundlehren von Offenbarung und heil. Schrift nach den socin. Unitariern, Jena, 1820, 8. *Winer*, p. 39.

[5] Compare below the §§ on Christology. As the Protestant doctrine of the Scriptures occupies an intermediate position between the Roman Catholic principle and that of the Quakers (§ 241, note 5), so it holds the medium between Quakerism and Socinianism, *i. e.*, between a purely *internal* supernaturalism of feeling, and a purely *external* supernaturalism of the understanding, which tends to rationalism. The principle of the Protestants is such as to induce them to combine depth with clearness, fervor with sobriety. It must, however, be admitted that this principle has not been always carried out in its purity.

§ 243.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

Inspiration and Interpretation.

Though the Reformers submitted in faith to the authority of Scripture as a divine revelation, they also had an unprejudiced regard to its *human* side, taking a comprehensive view of inspiration, especially in its practical bearing.[1] But the Protestant theologians

* "*The idea of revelation is not at all defined in the symbolical books, and the earlier theologians were either wholly silent on the subject, or gave very indistinct definitions.*" *De Wette*, Dogmatik, p. 32. It was discussed anew in the controversy with the Deists.

of later times frequently manifested such a narrow adherence to the letter of Scripture, that in opposition to the less rigid views of Arminians[2] and Socinians,[3] they were induced to hazard the most bold assertions.[4] The orthodox divines also developed the formal aspect of the *locus de Scriptura*,[5] while the mystics reminded men that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."[6] *Spener*, in particular, endeavoured to revive the Protestant principle of Scripture in its practical bearings, and thus to reconcile the spirit with the letter, in the sense of true Protestantism.[7] The Catholic church in general, held firmly to inspiration, though the views of the Jansenists on this point were stricter than those of the Jesuits.[8]—As regards the interpretation of Scripture, theologians of all denominations employed (consciously or unconsciously) the allegorical system, together with the grammatico-historical; but the latter was frequently domineered over by the dogmatism of the church doctrines.[9]—While *Coccejus* taught that every passage of Scripture was pregnant with sense, the example of the Arminians and Socinians, who were most earnest for a moderate intepretation,[10] was followed by others.[11] Even the Socinian principle that revelation can not contradict reason, was approved of by some, especially toward the close of the present period.[12]

[1] Luther had experienced in his own case the practical blessings of the Scripture, and everywhere shows the profoundest reverence for the Bible and the most lively sense of its divine blessedness, and of its peculiar worth as distinguished from other writings. So that he does not scruple to say, that we must look upon the Scripture, "as if God himself had spoken therein" (against Latonius, in *Walch*, xviii., p. 1456); and he calls the Holy Spirit "the most clear and simple writer there is in heaven and on earth" (*Walch*, xviii., 1602). Once he terms the holy word of Scripture "God himself" (Walch, ix., 688)....."To sum up all, the Holy Bible is the most excellent and best book of God, full of comfort in all temptations; concerning faith, hope, and love, it teaches very different things from those which reason can see and feel, comprehend and experience; and in adversities it teaches how Christian virtues are to shine forth, and that there is another and eternal life *beyond* this poor and miserable one." Tischreden (Francf., 1576), fol. 1. Along with this profound reverence for Scripture, he also expressed himself very freely about individual writers; thus, in the Preface to his New Test. about the Epistles of James (epistola straminea) and Jude, about the Apocalypse, etc.* Comp. the Preface to *W. Linkens*, Annotat. über die fünf

* Of special importance for the history of criticism at that time is the work of *Carlstadt*, De Canonicis Scripturis, written in 1520, edited by Credner in his Zur Geschichte des Kanons, Halle, 1847. *Carlstadt* found Luther's opinion about James reprehensible. On the other hand he earnestly defended the exclusion of the Old Testament Apochrypa from the canon; see *Jäger's* Carlstadt, p. 92 sq. *Brenz* agreed with Luther about the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse; but like Carlstadt, decidedly rejected the Apocrypha of the

Bücher Moses: "And doubtless the prophets studied Moses, and the later prophets studied the earlier ones, and wrote down in a book their *good thoughts, inspired by the Holy Ghost.* And though these good and true teachers and searchers sometimes fell upon hay, straw, and wood, and did not build of pure silver, gold, and precious stones alone, yet the foundation remains; the rest will be burnt up by the fire of the great day, as St. Paul says (1 Cor. iii. 13)." In another place he says (Walch, vii. 2044): "Moses and the prophets preached, *but in them we do not hear God himself;* for Moses received the law from the angels, and so had a less high order. When now I hear Moses, enjoining good works, I hear him as I do one, who executes the orders of an emperor or prince. *But this is not to hear God himself.* For when God himself talks with men, they cannot hear anything but pure grace, pity, and all that is good." That Luther concedes the existence of historical contradictions (*e. g.* between the Pentateuch and Stephen's address), is shown by *Schenkel*, ubi supra, i. 56.† Compare the passages in which he distinctly declares that Christ is *above* the Scripture; and that when the opponents insist upon Scripture against Christ, he "insists upon Christ against the Scriptures" (*Walch*, viii. 2140, and xix. 1749, in *Schenkel*, 226, *sq.*).—*Melancthon*, too, only claims freedom from error in the apostles as to doctrine, but not in the application of doctrine (as in the difference between Paul and Barnabas, and the relation of Peter to Paul in Antioch); see his Postil. Part II., p. 985. *Heppe* (p. 222), says "that there is no trace in Melancthon of a proper theory of inspiration!" *Zuingle* also judged of Scripture without preconceived notions, and considered the principal proof of its Divine origin to consist in the practical effects which it produces....."Take some good and strong wine; he who is in good health enjoys it, for it renders him merry, strengthens him, and warms his blood; but he who is suffering from pestilence or from fever may not even taste it, and still less drink it, and he wonders how people in health can drink it. But that is not on account of the wine, but on account of his disease. In the same manner the Word of God is perfect in itself, and revealed for the welfare of man; but he who neither loves it, nor understands it, nor will receive it, is sick. Thus much in reply to those who daringly assert, that God does not mean his Word to be understood, as if he desired to exclude us from its light." (Deutsche Schriften, i. p. 68.)—In *Calvin*, on the other hand, we find very strict ideas on inspiration; Instit. I. c. 7, 4: Tenendum, non ante stabiliri doctrinæ fidem, quam nobis indubie persuasum sit, *auctorem ejus esse Deum.* He appeals to the—testimonium Spiritus Sancti. Idem ergo Spiritus, qui per os prophetarum loquutus est, in corda nostra penetret necesse est, ut persuadeat fideliter protulisse, quod divinitus erat mandatum.....Illius (Spiritus Sancti) virtute illuminati, jam

Old Testament; see *Heppe*, p. 224. Among the Lutheran theologians, *Hafenreffer*, is the last who walks in this track, he calls the *ἀντιλέγομενα* of the New Testament, outright, the Libri Nov. Test. Apocryphi; see *Heppe*, p. 244. On the views of the Reformed divines, see *Heppe*, p. 254. [Musculus, Zanchius and Hyperius mention these books as having less external corroboration than the others; though enough to make them canonical.]

† *Bretschneider* collected the freer statements of Luther about inspiration, in his work Luther und seine Zeit, 1817, pp. 97–99.

non aut nostro, aut aliorum judicio credimus, a Deo esse Scripturam; sed supra humanum judicium, certo certius constituimus (non secus ac si ipsius Dei numen illic intueremur), hominum ministerio *ab ipsissimo Dei ore ad nos fluxisse*. Other passages in *Schenkel*, i. 62, *sq.* But with all this, Calvin grants a difference in Scripture, in respect to form. Instit. I. 8, 1: Lege Demosthenem aut Ciceronem, lege Platonem, Aristotelem, aut alios quosvis ex illa cohorte; mirum in modum, fateor, te allicient, oblectabunt, movebunt, rapient: verum inde si ad sacram istam lectionem te conferas, velis nolis ita vivide te afficiet, ita cor tuum penetrabit, ita medullis insidebit, ut præ istius sensus efficacia vis illa rhetorum ac philosophorum prope evanescat, *ut promtum sit perspicere, divinum quiddam spirare sacras scripturas*, quæ omnes humanæ industriæ dotes ac gratias tanto intervallo superent. 2: Fateor quidem Prophetis nonnullis elegans et nitidum, imo etiam splendidum esse dicendi genus, ut profanis scriptoribus non cedat facundia, ac talibus exemplis voluit ostendere Spir. S. non sibi defuisse eloquentiam, *dum rudi et crasso stilo alibi usus est.* As instances he adduces David and Isaiah on the one hand, Amos, Jeremiah, and Zechariah (quorum asperior sermo rusticitatem sapit) on the other.

[2] Limborch. Theol. Christ. i. 4, 10: De inspiratione Script. S. concludimus hinc, libros hosce a viris divinis scriptos, qui non tantum non errarunt, sed et, quia spiritu Dei regebantur, in tradenda voluntate divina errare non potuerunt; qui, sicut non propria voluntate, sed instinctu Spiritus S. ad scribendum se accinxerunt (2 Petr. i. 21), ita etiam in scribendo a Spir. S. directi fuerunt (2 Tim. iii. 6), adeo ut errorem nullum committere potuerint, nec in sensu ipso exprimendo, nec in verbis sensum continentibus divinum conscribendis aut dictandis. *Si quædam non exacte definiverint, fuere ea non res fidei* aut præcepta morum, sed rerum majorum parvæ circumstantiæ, ad fidem fulciendam nullum habentes momentum, circa quas tamen non erraruut aut memoria lapsi sunt, *solummodo eas, quia necesse non erat, accurate et præcise non determinarunt.*—*Grotius*, indeed, made much bolder assertions in his Votum pro Pace ecclesiastica (De canonicis scripturis.—Opp. Theol. Amst., 1679, T. iii. p. 672):—Non omnes libros, qui sunt in hebræo Canone, dictatos a Spir. S. . . . scriptos esse cum pio animi motu non nego. . . . sed a Spiritu Sancto *dictari* historias nihil fuit opus. . . . Vox quoque Spiritus Sancti ambigua est; nam aut significat. . . . afflatum divinum, qualem habuere tum Prophetæ ordinarii, tum interdum David et Daniel, aut significat *pium motum*, sive facultatem impellentem ad loquendum salutaria vivendi præcepta, vel res politicas et civiles, etc. (compare the subsequent chapters on different readings, etc.) *Episcopius* also passed judgment with much freedom on the canon (Institutt. iv. 1, 4): In hoc volumine continentur varii libelli, non qui singuli singulas religionis christianæ particulas in se habent, et conjuncti totam religionem christianam complectuntur ac constituunt; seu veluti partes essentiales totum, adeo ut si unus tantum deficeret aut deesset, religio Christi tota destruenda et plane desitura aut defutura esset; seu veluti partes integrales, ita ut librorum istorum uno aut pluribus deficientibus religio Christi mutila et trunca esset futura. Nihil minus: plures enim sunt libelli, qui nihil continent, quod non in aliis et sæpius et luculentius reperitur; et sunt, qui nihil ad religionem christianam magnopere faciens continent. Denique

certum est, libellos hos in codicem seu volumen unum digestos fuisse non divino jussu aut impulsu, sed consilio studioque humano, licet sancto pioque, etc.—He laid great stress upon the fides humana—viz, that the sacred penmen both would and could speak truth, etc. Comp. c. 2.

[3] "*Socinianism, in accordance with its dualistic and mechanical standpoint, could not regard the special mode of the influence of the Holy Spirit in any other aspect than that of an unmediated interposition of the divine causality in the very midst of human individuality; in this respect, Socinianism stands on the same position with the older Protestantism and Catholicism;*" *Fock*, Socinianismus, p. 329. Thus Socinus says, in a very orthodox way, that the sacred writers wrote—ab ipso divino Spiritu impulsi, *eoque dictante* (Lectiones Sacræ, p. 287; in *Fock*, ubi supra). Yet he restricts inspiration to what is essential, and concedes slight errors in what is unessential (leviter errare); see the passages in *Fock*, p. 332; and Socinus De Auctoritate Scripturæ, Racov., 1611 (Opera, i. p. 263, *sq.*)

[4] The Consensus Repetitus Fidei veræ Lutheranæ (ed. *Henke*, p. 5), asserts against Calixt, Punct. 6: Profitemur et docemus, omnia scripta prophetica et apostolica dici divina, quia a Deo ceu fonte sunt et divinitica tradita veritas, nihilque in illis inveniri, quod Deum non habeat auctorem, vel Deo inspirante, suggerente et *dictante* non sit scriptum, testibus Paulo, 1 Cor. iii. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 16; et Petro, 2 Pet. 1, 20. Rejicimus eos, qui docent, scripturam dici divinam, non quod singula, quæ in ea continentur, divinæ peculiari revelationi imputari oporteat, sed quod præcipua, sive quæ primario et per se respicit ac intendit scriptura, nempe quæ redemptionem et salutem generis humani concernunt, nonnisi divinæ illi peculiari revelationi debeantur. (Even passages like 2 Tim. iv. 13, form no exceptions.) This rigid adherence to the very letter of Scripture (grammatolatry) manifested itself especially in the Formula Consensus, 1: Deus O. M. verbum suum, quod est potentia ad salutem omni credenti (Rom. i. 16), non tantum per Mosen, Prophetas et Apostolos scripto mandari curavit, sed etiam pro eo scripto paterne vigilavit hactenus et excubavit,* ne Satanæ astu vel fraude ulla humana vitiari posset. Proinde merito singulari ejus gratiæ et bonitati Ecclesia acceptum refert, quod habet habebitque ad finem mundi sermonem propheticum firmissimum; nec non *ἱερὰ γράμματα*, sacras litteras, ex quibus, pereunte cœlo et terra, ne apex quidem vel iota unicum peribit (2 Pet. v. 19, 2 Tim. iii. 15, Matth. v. 18). 2: In specie autem hebraïcus V. T. codex, quem traditione Ecclesiæ judaïcæ, cui olim oracula Dei commissa sunt (Rom. iii. 2), accepimus hodieque retinemus, *tum quoad consonas, tum quoad vocalia sive puncta ipsa* sive punctorum saltem potestatem, et *tum quoad res, tum quoad verba θεόπνευστος*, ut fidei et vitæ nostræ, una cum Codice N. T. sit Canon unicus et illibatus, ad cujus normam ceu Lydium lapidem universæ quæ extant versiones, sive orientales sive occidentales, exigendæ, et sicubi deflectunt, revocandæ sunt. (But compare *Schweizer*, Die theol. ethischen Zustände, p. 37).—The Lutheran theologians also maintained that the Hebrew vowel points were original; Joh. Gerh. Loci Theol. i. c. 14, 15;

* How much this mere *watching* and *guarding* of a dead treasure is in accordance with their lifeless notions of God, and the relation in which he stands to the world, is evident. Nothing creative, either in the one case or the other!

Quenst. i. 272, ss., and *Hollaz.* Prol. iii. Quæst. xliii. and others.—The controversies respecting the purity of the Greek of the New Test. belong to the same class (Purists and Hebraists); see *Winer*, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms, Einleitung, and *Gass*, ubi supra, 159. In the year 1714, *G. Nitsch* (who died 1729, superintendent in Gotha), even raised the question whether the Holy Scripture was God himself or a creature? See *Walch*, Relig. Streitigkeiten innerhalb d. evang. Kirche, iii. p. 145, and i. p. 966. *Tholuck*, ubi supra, p. 253, *sq.*

[5] Thus the idea of *inspiration* was more precisely defined; it was at first identified with revelation but afterwards treated of by itself (see *Heppe*, p. 250). Comp. Gerhard, Loci i. c. 12. § 12: *causa efficiens* Scripturæ Sacræ principalis est Deus. § 18: Causæ instrumentalis fuerunt sancti homines. Scripserunt non ut homines, sed ut Dei homines h. e. ut Dei servi et peculiaria Dei organa. *Hollaz*, Prol. iii., Qu. vi., p. 75.... : Sicut *scriptura, quam homo alteri in calamum dictat*, recte dicitur verbum humanum in litteras relatum, ita Scriptura a Deo inspirata verissime dicitur verbum Dei litteris consignatum. Quæst. xvi.: Conceptus omnium rerum, quæ in sacris litteris habentur, prophetis et apostolis a Spir. S. immediate inspirati sunt. Qu. xviii.: Omnia et singula verba, quæ in sacro codice leguntur, a Spir. S. prophetis et apostolis inspirata et in calamum dictata sunt. Compare other passages quoted by *De Wette*, Dogmatik, and *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus.—The divinity of Scripture was founded partly upon the fides divina (the testimony of the Holy Spirit), and partly upon the fides humana (*αὐθεντία* and *ἀξιοπιστία*); it then served in its turn as the source from which the so-called *affectiones Sacræ Scripturæ* were derived. These were: I. Affect. primariæ: 1. divina auctoritas, 2. veritas, 3. perfectio, 4. perspicuitas (semetipsam interpretandi facultas), 5. efficacia divina; II. secundariæ: 1. necessitas, 2. integritas et perennitas, 3. puritas et sinceritas fontium, 4. authentica dignitas. Attention was also directed to the simplicitas et majestas stili, etc. Comp. *Gerhard*, Loci l. c., *Calov.* Systema T. i., p. 528 ss., and the other compendiums of systematic theology. (See *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 99 ss., *De Wette*, p. 39.) Compare *Gass*, Geschicte d. Theologie, p. 235 sq. *Heppe*, Dogmatik des deutschen Protest. i. 240 sq.

[6] Luther was no stranger to the thought, that the external word alone is not sufficient, but that the Holy Spirit, working internally in the hearts of the readers (hearers) is needed to produce a right understanding of the Scriptures: see his Letters in *De Wette's* edition, v., p. 85, No. 1784; and the passages cited by *Heppe*, p. 235. The later orthodox theology, too, was familiar with the idea of the testimony of the Holy Spirit; see *Klaiber*, Die Lehre der altprotestant. Dogmatiker von dem Testimonium Spiritus Sancti, und ihre dogmatische Bedeutung, in the Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, 1857. But the mystics of the Protestant church were the chief opponents of the literal orthodoxy. Thus *Jacob Böhme* said: "Though reason may cry: Give me only the letter of Scripture, yet the external letter does not impart sufficient knowledge, although it may guide us in our researches; the living letter also, which is the independent and revealed word, and nature of God, must through the medium of the revealed word, be laid open and read in the man, who is taught and instructed by the Holy Ghost

himself;" in the preface to his work: Von der Geburt und Bezeichnung aller Wesen, quoted by *Umbreit*, in his Jakob Böhm, p. 66.—Previous to the time of Böhme, *Sebastian Frank* of Wörd (who lived in the sixteenth century) had maintained that "the devil himself may be well versed in Scripture, and even adhere to its very letter, as he is now doing in the case of so many sects which have nothing in their favor but mere Scripture," etc., quoted by *Umbreit*, l. c., p. 60; see § 241. *Weigel*, Postille, vol. ii., pp. 62, 63; iii., p. 84, says: "Scripture, as such, is a dead letter, and an empty word, which sounds through the air;" and in another work, entitled Gülden Griff, c. 19: "It is not enough to say, here is such a writer, and he has the Holy Spirit, he can not make a mistake. My dear friend! first of all prove the truth of thy statement; thou wilt find it a difficult work to prove and demonstrate it. Who is Cephas? who is Paul? says the apostle; who is this man or that? They are all men. It is *God*, *God*, *God* alone, who works by faith, and imparts judgment to try the spirits and discern the writings;" comp. *Walch*, Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten, vol iv., p. 1044, 45. In the same manner *Christian Hobury* (quoted by Hollaz, ed. Teller, p. 75) expressed himself as follows: Scripture, is an old, cold and dead thing, which makes men mere Pharisees."—*Arnd*, Wahres Christenthum, p. 28, used more moderate language, but more to the point: "God did not reveal his Holy Word that it might remain a dead letter, but that it might become a living power within us, and create in us an entirely new and spiritual nature, otherwise it is of no use. All that Scripture teaches externally must be worked into man through Christ, in the spirit and in faith." Ibid., p. 89; "*The living Christ is the book which we must read, and from which we must learn.*" On the *Rothmann* controversy about the efficacy of the word of the Bible, see *Cotta*, Præf. in Gerhard, p. 24; *Walch*, Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten der Lutherischen Kirche, i., p. 524 sq; *Gass*, ubi supra, p. 265.

[7] *Spener* agreed with the mystics in this, that the dead letter avails nothing. But he opposed quite as decidedly the preeminence assigned to the Spirit without Scripture. Thus he said, in opposition to the notions of the Quakers: "Our feelings are not the norm of truth, but divine truth is the norm of our feelings. This rule of truth exists in the Divine Word *apart from ourselves*;" see the passages quoted by *Hennicke*, pp. 6 and 7.—Concerning the right of the laity to read and search the Sacred Scriptures, he expressed himself as follows (Geistliches Priesterthum, Francfort, 1677, p. 29): "Since the epistle of our heavenly Father is addressed to all his children, no child of God is to be excluded from its perusal; all have not only this right, but are also commanded to read it." "They must also search the Scriptures that they may be enabled to examine the doctrine of their minister, in order that their faith may not be founded upon the authority and testimony of men, but upon divine truth." But Spener made special efforts to render the *Bible* practical,* both among the people (by a more

* Spener thought it even desirable (p. 38) that the laity should study Greek and Hebrew, "to be enabled to understand the revelations of the Holy Spirit in his own language;" nevertheless, "the want of acquaintance with foreign languages does not exclude pious Christians from a true knowledge of that which God has deemed necessary for the edification of their souls."

popular interpretation of Scripture), and among theologians by his Collegia Biblica. See his Pia Desideria (Francf. 1712,) p. 94 ss.

[8] The Universities of Louvain and Douay condemned (A. D. 1588) the position of the Jesuits, that it was not necessary to suppose that all the words of Scripture are inspired by the Holy Ghost. A controversy respecting inspiration was carried on (A. D. 1622) between the Jansenists and the Jesuit *Jean Adam*. In his opinion the sacred penmen have sometimes made exaggerated statements; on the whole, it is by no means necessary to take everything in Scripture in its most literal sense. The Jansenists showed the dangerous tendency of such assertions. *Reuchlin*, Geschichte von Port-Royal, i., p. 613 ss.—In opposition to the Protestant doctrine concerning Scripture, *Bellarmine* maintained (De Verbo Dei, iv., 4):.... Apostolos non de *scribendo*, sed de *prædicando* Evangelio primaria intentione cogitasse. Præterea, si doctrinam suam litteris consignare *ex proffesso* voluissent, certe catechismum aut similem librum confecissent. At ipsi vel historiam scripserunt, ut Evangelistæ, vel epistolas ex occasione aliqua, ut Petrus, Paulus, Jacobus etc., et in iis *nonnisi obiter* [?] disputationes de dogmatibus tractaverunt. —He rejected the testimony of Scripture in favor of inspiration, as a testimony in its own cause; not only the Bible, but also the Koran, claims inspiration! He further maintained that there is no sure criterion for the canonicity of the separate books in Scripture itself, etc.*—Nor were the critical investigations of Richard Simon reconcilable with the idea of verbal inspiration. Compare his Traité de l'Inspiration des Livres sacrés. Rotterd. 1687.

[9] On the difference betweeen the hermeneutical principles of the Protestants, and those of the Roman Catholics, see above, § 240, notes 6 and 7. For further particulars compare *Clausen*, Hermeneutik, p. 277 ss.

[10] Liber de potentiæ S. S.—Comp. Aphorismi contra Pontificios. Animadversiones in Bellarmini controversias. His main principle was, "*that the words of Scripture must everywhere be supposed to signify just as much as they may signify.*" In essential opposition to the principle of Arminians and Socinians, acording to which every passage is to be considered separately and in its historical limits (so that passages are not to be adduced in parallelism, by the analogy of faith), Coccejus endeavoured to treat the various books of the Bible as connected parts of a greater whole, so that the one is reflected by the other. Comp. *Clausen*, Hermeneutik, p. 282, ss. It is a well-known saying: Grotium nusquam in sacris litteris (V. T.) invenire Christum, Coccejum ubique.—Some orthodox divines, like *Calov*, inveighed with all earnestness against the emancipation of exegesis from dogmatics; see *Gass*, p. 164, *sq.* *Hyperius*, among the Reformed divines, made some concessions to the allegorical mode of interpretation; see *Heppe*, p. 253.

[11] *e. g. Turretine*, *Werenfels*, and others. The skeptical sentence of Werenfels is well known:

> Hic liber est, in quo sua quærit dogmata quisque,
> Invenit, et iterum dogmata quisque sua.

* To refute *Calvin* (Institt. vii, 12), in whose view the Sacred Scriptures are distinguished from profane writings, as light from darkness, and sweet from sour, he adduced the opinion of Luther, who called the Epistle of James a straw Epistle.

[12] Thus *Becker* (Die bezauberte Welt, preface, p. 11, ss.), represented reason as preceding Scripture, but maintained that they did not contradict each other. "To say the truth, reason must precede Scripture, because Scripture presupposes reason; I mean sound reason, to which Scripture must prove its divine origin. Reason exists along with Scripture, speaking of things concerning which the latter is silent. Scripture exists along with reason, because it teaches us something very different, which does not belong to the province of reason. And, lastly, Scripture is, nevertheless, above reason, not as lord and master (for each has its respective office), but because it possesses greater dignity and larger means.....But at times it happens that they meet by the way, or have a meeting in some house, and thus assist each other; both remain, however, free, with this difference only, that reason, acknowledging its inferiority, always pays deference to Scripture."

Though Protestants were accustomed to consider both the Old and the New Testament as constituting the *one* norm of faith, it was natural that the material principle of faith, as seen in the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith, should exert a reaction upon the formal, and render necessary some kind of subordination of the Old Testament to the New (of the law to the gospel.) The symbolical books make a difference between the ceremonial and the moral law. The former had typical significance, and is already fulfilled; the latter partly shows us the nature of sin (as in a mirror), and partly is still of importance as a rule of life. Comp. Articles of Smalcald, Art. 2, p. 319; Apol. p. 83; Confess. Gallic. Art. 23; Belg. 25; Helv. II., c. 12, 13.—In reference to the Antinomian controversy (§ 217, note 7), started by *John Agricola*, of Eisleben, see the Formula Concordiæ, Art. 5 and 6 (de tertio usu legis).—But it can not well be said that the law and the gospel are identical, the one with the Old, the other with the New Testament; for the prophecies in the Old Testament partake of the nature of the gospel, while the New Testament contains moral precepts. See the preface of Luther to his translation of the New Testament, 1522. On this whole section, see *Schenkel*, i., 165 sq.

§ 244.

RELATION OF SCRIPTURE TO TRADITION.

Compare the works of *Schmid* and *Gass*, on Calixt, referred to in § 237. [*Heinrich Julius Holtzmann*, Kanon und Tradition, Ein Beitrag zur neueren Dogmengeschichte und Symbolik, Ludwigsburg, 1859. *J. L. Jacobi*, Lehre von der Tradition, i., Berl. 1847.]

With all its adherence to the authority of Scripture, Protestantism could not absolutely withdraw itself from the power of tradition.[1] For even the authority of Scripture rested upon the belief of the church. The whole historical development could not be ignored; and the reformers had no hesitation in respect to ecclesiastical usages in particular, to concede to tradition a certain normal, though only human, authority.[2] But even in relation to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, Protestantism declared its agreement with the oldest creeds of the church, because it believed that the pure doctrine of Scripture was contained in them; yet without thinking it to be

necessary, or even advisable, to give these symbols special authority as coördinate with the Scriptures.[3] Accordingly, when *George Calixt*, in the seventeenth century, advocated the position that the *consensus* of the ancient church should be taken as an authority alongside of the Scriptures,[4] he aroused a lively opposition.[5] But with all its theoretical opposition to any other authority than that of Scripture, Protestantism soon came to be dependent upon its own tradition; for the words of Luther, and the declarations of the confessions of faith, became (as it was not intended they should be) a standard and restraint in the subsequent exegetical and doctrinal development.[6]

[1] Comp. *Winer*; Comparat. Darstellung, p. 33. *Marheineke*, Symbolik, ii. 191, *sq.* *Schenkel*, Wesen des Protest., i. 40, *sq.*

[2] As in the case of the baptism of children, and several other observances, like the celebration of Sunday and the church festivals. Accordingly the XXXIX. Articles of the Church of England declare (in Art. xxxiv.): "It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, *so that nothing is ordained against God's Word.* Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, *which be not repugnant to the Word of God*, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the conscience of the weak brethren.—Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the church, *ordained only by man's authority*, so that all things be done to edifying." To the same effect, Luther in his Letters (*De Wette's* edition, iii. 294); Nullas ceremonias damno, nisi quæ pugnent cum evangelio; ceteras omnes in ecclesia nostra servo integras.....Nullos magis odi quam eos, qui ceremonias liberas et innoxias exturbant, et necessitatem ex libertate faciunt.

[3] Thus the three œcumenical symbols, the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, and the Athanasian, were adopted by the Protestant church, and introduced by the Lutherans into their Book of Concord. *Melancthon* terms these creeds (in his Enarr. Symb.)—breves repetitiones doctrinæ, in scriptis propheticis et apostolicis traditæ. The Second Helvetic Confession refers to the Confession of Faith of the Roman bishop Damasus (in Jerome); which is printed in the older editions of the Helvetic Confession, and in Fritzsche's ed., pp. 9, 10.

[4] Calixt defends himself against the accusation, of not regarding the Scripture as sufficient, of holding that it is not—unum, primum et summum principium. He finds in tradition only the testimony of the church to the doctrine of the Scriptures. Yet still he speaks of two principles; *e. g.*, in his De Arte Nova, p. 49: Duo vero sunt principia, quæ tamquam certissima

et extra omnem dubitationis aleam posita utrimque admittimus, quæ etiam sufficere credimus—*divinæ legis auctoritas*, tum deinde *ecclesiæ catholicæ traditio*. By tradition he means the consensus primævæ vel priscæ antiquitatis; see his letter to the Landgrave Ernest, p. 22: Nos principium primum ponimus: quidquid Sacra Scriptura docet, est verum; proximum ad hoc: quidquid primorum quinque seculorum ecclesia unanimiter professus est, est verum. Pag. 23: Quæ autem nisce symbolis, confessionibus et declarationibus comprehenduntur, e sacra Scriptura hausta sunt. See other passages in *Schmid*, Dogmatik d. luth. Kirche, p. 124. *Gass*, p. 46 *sq.* [See also, *Gieseler*, Church Hist., New York ed. iv., § 52.]

[5] *Calov* was his chief opponent, in his work Syncretismus Calixtinus, and in other writings; see *Schmid*, p. 240, *sq.* *Gass*, p. 87. [*Schweizer*, Centr.al Dogmen. ii. 532, *sq.*] The Fifth point in the Consensus Repetitus Fidei Veræ Luth. (in *Henke's* ed. p. 5), was directed against him: Rejicimus eos, qui docent, testimonium ecclesiæ necessarium esse ad cognoscendum Dei verbum, ita ut sine illo per alia κριτήρια cognosci nequeat; auctoritatem sacr. litterarum aliunde non constare, nisi e testificatione ecclesiæ etc. Comp. Punct. 6–8.

[6] It is well-known that *Luther* strongly protested against any prominence being given to his name, and all appeal to his authority. Equally opposed was it to the spirit of the Confession of Faith, to impose it as a yoke upon the conscience. The First Confession of Basle solemnly warns against this, at the conclusion: "In fine, we submit this our Confession to the judgment of the divine writings of Scripture, beseeching that if we are better instructed from the Holy Scripture, we may at all times obey God and his word with great thankfulness. Comp. Conf. Helv. II. and Confess. Scotica, at the close of the Preface. The Lutheran Formula Concordiæ also says distinctly, p. 372: Cæterum autem Symbola et alia scripta.....non obtinent auctoritatem judicis; hæc enim dignitas solis sacris litteris debetur; sed duntaxat pro religione nostra testimonium dicunt eamque explicant, ac ostendunt, quomodo singulis temporibus sacræ litteræ in articulis controversis in ecclesia Dei a doctoribus, qui tum vixerunt, intellectæ et explicatæ fuerint, et quibus rationibus dogmata cum sacra Scriptura pugnantia rejecta et condemnata sint. —On the other hand, the Formula Consensus, Art. 26, brings the Holy Scripture (the Word of God) into such connection with the Confessions, that they seem to put on one and the same line. See also the Conclusions of the Canons of Dort. [But these Conclusions simply say: "This doctrine, the synod judges to be drawn from the Word of God, and to be agreeable to the Confessions of the Reformed churches;" and it warns people to "abstain from all those phrases, which exceed the limits necessary to be observed in ascertaining the genuine sense of the Holy Scriptures."] On the history of the matter, see *J. C. G. Johannsen*, Die Aufänge des Symbolzwanges unter den Protestanten, Lpz., 1847.

SECOND DIVISON.

ANTHROPOLOGY, JUSTIFICATION, AND THE ECONOMY OF REDEMPTION.

(MATERIAL PRINCIPLE.)

A. ANTHROPOLOGY.

§ 245.

MAN PRIOR TO THE FALL.

[Bishop *George Bull*, Concerning the first Covenant, and the State of Man before the Fall. Works, ii. p. 32–237.]

During the present period, the opinion generally prevailed, among Christians of all denominations, that the state of our first parents was more excellent, both in respect to body and soul, *prior* to the fall, than after it.[1] But while theologians of the Roman Catholic Church agreed with the majority of the scholastics in regarding the original righteousness of man as a donum superadditum,[2] Protestants (Lutherans as well as Calvinists) maintained that God created man in the possession of perfect righteousness and holiness,[3] qualities which, together with immortality, belonged to his original nature. *Arminians*,[4] and *Socinians*,[5] entertained less exalted opinions concerning the original state of man. The latter asserted, that the image of God, after which man was created, has reference only to his dominion over animals, or the irrational creation in general, and denied that immortality belonged to the original endowments of human nature.[6]

[1] Conc. Trid. sess. 5 : Si quis non confitetur, primum hominem....sanctitatem et justitiam, in qua constitutus fuerat, amisisse incurrisseque mortem, quam antea illi comminatus fuerat Deus, anathema sit. (This was in accorddance with the definitions of the Protestant Symbols, see note 3.) Comp the Confess. Orthod. of the Greek Church p. 50, quoted by *Winer*, p. 51.

[2] Cat. Rom. i. 2, 19:....Originalis *justitiæ admirabile donum addidit*, ac deinde cæteris animantibus præesse voluit. This is more fully developed by *Bellarmine*, Tom. iv., De Gratia primi hom., c. 2., Propos. 4: Integritas illa, cum qua primus homo conditus fuit et sine qua post ejus lapsum hominis omnes nascuntur, non fuit naturalis ejus conditio, sed supernaturalis evectio. Comp. c. 5:....Quare non magis differt status hominis post lapsum Adæ a statu ejusdem in puris naturalibus, quam differt spoliatus a nudo. In the following chapter, the justitia originalis is compared to the hair of Samson, to a festive garment and ornament, etc.* c. 6: Virtutes non erant insitæ et impressæ ipsi naturæ, ut sunt dona naturalia, sed extrinsecus assutæ et superadditæ, ut sunt dona supernaturalia. c. 7: The dowry of Paradise was splendid, while that of nature, in its present condition, is like a stepmother's dowry, (appealing to Augustine). Comp. *Marheineke*, Symbolik, Vol. iii., towards the commencement; *Möhler*, Symbolik, § 1; *Baur*, Katholicismus und Protestantismus, p. 60 ss.

[3] *Luther* himself gave it as his opinion (in Gen. c. 3—Opp. ed. Jen. T. i., p. 83, quoted by *Möhler*, p. 35.); Justitiam non fuisse quoddam donum, quod ab extra accederet, separatum a natura hominis sed fuisse vere naturalem, ut natura Adæ esset diligere Deum, credere Deo, cognoscere Deum, etc. On Luther's poetic and fanciful descriptions of the paradisiacal state, see *Schenkel*, ii. 14, *sq.* (Man is made for heaven; that distinguishes him from "cows and swine." The eye of the first man surpassed the lynx and eagle in sharpness; his arm was stronger than the lion and the bear; he went among the strongest animals as if they were hounds.)—*Zwingle* is far more sober, averse from all that is fantastic, perhaps even too spiritualizing in his views of the primeval state; as in his work, Von der Klarheit des Wortes Gottes (German Works, i. 56): "Were we made in the likeness of God in our bodies, God must also have a body made up of members, after which ours were fashioned; whence it would follow that God is a compound, and that the parts might be separated—all of which is opposed to the immutability of the divine nature. Hence it follows, that we are fashioned in the image of God in our minds or souls. But what this image is we know not, excepting that the soul is the substance, upon which the the image of God is specially impressed. And as we have never seen God in himself, in his own form, we cannot know how our souls are like him in substance and nature; for the soul does not even know its own substance and nature. And it all at last comes to this, that the workings or powers of the soul, viz., will, understanding, and memory, are nothing but signs of the essential image, which we shall really see, when we see God as he is in himself, and ourselves in him (1 Cor. xiii. 12).....Now we find in ourselves, that the image of God is much more cognate with some things, than with the three powers, will, understanding, and memory.†.....I mean, that there are other parts of us in which we may discern the image of God.... such as the vision of Him and his Word; these are things which show that

* Other comparisons, *e. g.* that with the wreath of a virgin, a golden bridle, etc., are quoted by *Marheineke*, Symbolik, iii. p. 12.

† Referring to Augustine, who finds in these an image of the Trinity.

friendship, likeness, and conformity to God may be in us....For the fact that man can look up to God and his Word shows clearly, that in his nature he is born somewhat akin to God, that he can follow after him, that he can be drawn unto him, from all of which it follows without any doubt, that he is created in the image of God.—*Calvin* tries to harmonize the bodily and the spiritual, by representing the former as the foil of the latter: Institutes, I. 15, § 3: Quamvis imago Dei in homine externo refulgeat, proprium tamen imaginis semen in anima esse, dubium non est (this is against Osiander, who sought for the image of God in the body). § 4. He speaks of the image of God, as—integra humanæ naturæ præstantia, quæ refulsit in Adam ante defectionem....nunc aliqua ex parte conspicitur in electis, quatenus spiritu regeniti sunt; plenum vero fulgorem obtinebit in cœlo. (He agrees with Zwingle in opposing Augustine's view of the image of the Trinity). § 8:.... His præclaris dotibus excelluit prima hominis conditio, ut ratio, intelligentia, prudentia, judicium non modo ad terrenæ vitæ gubernationem suppeterent, sed quibus transcenderent usque ad Deum et æternam felicitatem....In hac integritate libero arbitrio pollebat homo, quo, si vellet, adipisci posset æternam vitam. Comp. *Schenkel*, ii. p. 11, *sq.*—Among the Lutheran symbols, the Augsburg Confession passes by the primitive state of man; but the doctrine is contained in the Apol. Conf. Aug. p. 53, ss.: Justitia originalis habitura erat non solum æquale temperamentum qualitatum corporis, sed etiam hæc dona, notitiam Dei certiorem, timorem Dei, fiduciam Dei aut certe rectitudinem et vim ista efficiendi. Idque testatur Scriptura, cum inquit, hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei conditum esse (Genes i. 27). Quod quid est aliud, nisi in homine hanc sapientiam et justitiam effigiatam esse, quæ Deum apprehenderet et in qua reluceret Deus, h. e. homini dona esse data notitiam Dei, timorem Dei, fiduciam erga Deum et similia? Comp. p. 52: Propriis viribus posse diligere Deum super omnia, facere præcepta Dei, quid aliud est quem habere justitiam originis? Comp. Form. Concord. p. 640.—Confess. Basil. I. Art. 2: "Concerning man, we confess that he was at first created by God after the image of God's holiness and justice." (Gen. i. Eph. iv. 24. Gen. iii.) Conf. Helv. II. 8: Fuit homo ab initio a Deo conditus ad imaginem Dei, in justitia et sanctitate veritatis, bonus et rectus. Comp. Conf. Belg. Art. 14. Scotica 2. Gallic. 9. Cat. Heidelb. 6. Canon Dordrac. 3, 1 (where perhaps the strongest statements are made), and Form. Concord. 7.—Compare the definitions of the later Lutheran and Reformed theologians quoted by *De Wette*, Dogmatik, p. 91; *e. g. Calov*, iv. 392.... Eminebat cognitio primæva præ moderna quorumvis, sive Theologorum sive Philosophorum aliorumve sapientum, peritia et sapientia. *Polanus*, p. 2122: Homo integer recte cognoscebat Deum et opera Dei atque se ipsum, et sapienter intelligebat omnia simplicia, singularia et universalia eaque recte componebat aut dividebat et ex compositis absque errore ratiocinabatur.—Those theologians who adopted the theory of the covenants, supposed the status operum to have had place in this original state of man. Comp. *De Wette*, Dogmatik, p. 91.—*Zwingle* also included the possibility of sinning among the endowments of man's moral nature in his primitive estate. De Provid. Dei (Opera, iv. p. 139): Quanto magis omnium operum rarissimum homo non est miser, quantum ad genus attinet: hic enim quum intellectu

præditus sit, supra omnia sensibilia dignitate evehitur. Ea enim, præter hominem, universa intellectu carent, qui ex primis dotibus numinis præcipuus est. Ipsum igitur dum cum numine communem, quantumvis mutuo, habet; jam tantum est nobilior homo reliquis sensibilibus, quanto lux tenebris, volucres reptilibus, et anima corpore. Non est ergo vel imprudentiæ vel indignationis Dei opus homo sic factus, ut labi possit, quemadmodum et de angelo sentiendum est: quum enim soli cum numine intellectum habent, dotem divinissimam, et nihil tam infirmum ac humile est, quod non sit in suo genere et optimum et utilissimum: jam et homo erit in sua classe absolutissime divina providentia factus. Quæ ergo imprudentes miseriæ damus, felicitatis sunt. *Labi potuisse a numine est inditum*; fuit ergo insignis alicujus boni causa. So, too, *Calvin*, ubi supra. *Bucanus*, iii. (in *Schweizer*, i. 188): Adamum flexibilem fecit, non talem, qui non posset nec vellet unquam peccare. Immutabilem esse solius Dei est. *Keckermann*, 141, and others, cited by *Schweizer*, ubi supra. Comp. *Heppe*, 384, *sq.*, 354, *sq.*

[4] The *Arminian symbols* (Confess. Remonstrant. 5. 5. and Apol. Confess. p. 60, quoted by *Winer*, p. 52), agree with Calvin in insisting on the original freedom of the will, but reject on this very account the notion of a primitive state of perfect holiness, because if there had been such, man could not have sinned. Thus *Limborch*, Theolog. Christ. ii. 24, 5, shows that that state of innocence of our first parents to which so much importance is attached, must have been united with *ignorance* (nesciebant nuditatem esse indecoram); otherwise they would have known that serpents cannot speak, and would have been led to suspect something wrong! Limborch admitted that man would not have died, if he had not sinned, but he objected to the inference which orthodox theologians drew from it—viz., that immortality originally belonged to the nature of man;* he thought that God would have protected him against death.

[5] Cat. Racov. p. 18 (quoted by *Winer*, p. 52). Socinus, Præl. c. 3: Si justitiæ originalis nomine eam conditionem intelligunt, ut non posset peccare, eam certe non habuit Adamus, cum eum peccasse constet; neque enim peccasset, nisi prius peccare potuisset.....Concludamus igitur, Adamum etiam antequam mandatum illud Dei transgrederetur, *revera justum non fuisse*, cum nec impeccabilis esset nec ullam peccandi occasionem habuisset, vel certe justum eum fuisse affirmari non posse, cum nullo modo constet, eum ulla ratione a peccatis abstinuisse. Compare also Cat. Racov. Qu. 22 (the last revision, as quoted by *Winer*, l. c.) *Fock*, Socinianismus, p. 472, *sq.*

[6] Catechismus Roman. Qu. 40.....ut homo nihil habet commune cum immortalitate. Qu. 41: Cur nihil habet commune homo cum immortalitate? Idcirco quod ab initio de humo formatus proptereaque mortalis creatus fuerit. *Socinus*, De Statu primi Hominis ante Lapsum (in opposition to Francis Pucci of Florence), 1578, in the Bibl. Fratr. Polon. ii. p. 253, ss., p. 258: Nego, hominem a Deo immortalem fuisse creatum.—But he did not mean to say, eum ab ipso creationis initio morti penitus fuisse obnoxium, adeo ut omnino ei moriendum esset, sed tantummodo sua natura morti fuisse

* On the question, how far other Protestants taught that man, *posse non mori*, see *Winer*, p. 52.

objectum, et nonnisi divina gratia, qua in ipsa creatione donatus non fuerat, a morte immunem perpetuo esse potuisse. In support of his opinion he appealed to 1 Cor. xv. 22, and 2 Tim. i. 10. By thus considering Christ as the true author of life, he advocated the principles of supernaturalism. On similar views entertained by earlier theologians, see Vol. i. § 58, pp. 158–9, and *Fock*, Socinianismus, p. 483, *sq.* The latter says (p. 490): "The idea that man became mortal at some definite point of time, being at first immortal, was so much opposed to all sound views of nature, that a system which declared that reason was its guide, could not be satisfied with it. On the other side, however, we must not overlook the fact that the orthodox doctrine of man's immortality in his primeval estate has an essential speculative kernel, viz., that immortality belongs to the very idea of human nature."

Concerning the opinions of the Mennonites, the Quakers, and the theologians of the Greek Church, which are of less importance, see *Winer*, l. c.

How far *Calixtus* recognized the justitia originalis as a donum supernaturale, and on this account was accused of papistry by his opponents, see in the Consensus Repet., Punctum 17 (*Henke's* edition, p. 14); and *Schmid*, u. s., 363.

§ 246.

THE FALL AND ITS CONSEQUENCES. (ORIGINAL SIN.)

(*Definitions of the Symbols.*)

In connection with these opinions respecting the original state of man, was developed the Protestant doctrine concerning the fall, as propounded in most of the works of the reformers,[1] as well as in the symbolical books of the churches.[2] This doctrine represented the fall of man as a fact by which his inmost nature was corrupted, his original righteousness changed into absolute depravity, and whose consequences have so affected his descendants, as to expose them, in their natural condition, to condemnation, and to make them unable to do anything that is truly good. The views of Roman Catholics were less rigid: in their opinion the fall of man caused only the loss of the gifts of divine grace, the natural consequences of which are his imperfections and infirmity.[3] The *Arminians* entertained still milder views,[4] while the *Socinians* bordered more than any other sect upon Pelagianism.[5] In accordance with some earlier theologians, they declared corporeal death to be the chief consequence of the first sin, and derived the existence of moral infirmity merely from the habit of sinning, but not from the sin of Adam.

[1] The strictly Augustinian view of *Luther* stood in intimate connection with his whole tone of mind, as well as with the experience of his life. It

was confirmed by the contests which he maintained against the superficial Pelagian doctrine of his opponents, concerning the meritoriousness of works. He developed his principles especially in his controversy with Erasmus whose views laid down in his treatise, De libero Arbitrio, 1524, he combated in his work, De servo Arbitrio, 1525, in opposition to which Erasmus composed the Hyperaspistes, 1526. In other passages *Luther* also uses very strong language about original sin, which he calls, among other things, the leaven of the devil, with which our nature is poisoned; see Walch., ii. 2146 sq., vi. 396, xi. 2605; and *Schenkel*, ii. 16 sq. *Heppe*, 388. ["Original sin is the real and chief sin; if that were not, there were no actual sins. This sin is not committed like other sins; but it is, it lives, and does all other sins, and is the essential sin; one which does not merely sin an hour or any given time, but wherever and as long as the person lives, there too is sin." Werke, xi. 396. See also Luther's Lehre von der Gnade, in the Theologische Zeitschrift, 1860.] *Melancthon*, in the first edition of his Loci, adopted the doctrine of the total corruption of mankind, and the lack of free will (Edit. Augusti, p. 18 ss), p. 19: Jam posteaquam deliquit Adam, aversatus est Deus hominem, ut non adsit ei gubernator Dei spiritus. Ita fit, ut anima, luce vitaque cœlesti carens, excœcetur et sese ardentissime amet, sua quærat, non cupiat, non velit, nisi carnalia, etc. Ibid.: Sicut in igni est genuina vis, qua sursum fertur, sicut in magnete est genuina vis, qua ad se ferrum trahit, ita est in homine nativa vis ad peccandum.—In his opinion as in that of Luther,* the virtues of the Gentiles are only—virtutum umbræ. Thus Socrates, Cato, and others, were only virtuous from ambition....Pag. 23: Ut rem omnem velut in compendium cogam, omnes homines per vires naturæ vere semperque peccatores sunt et peccant. Comp. *Galle's* Melancthon, p. 237, ss. [Melancthon on the Nature of Sin, in Theological Essays from the Princeton Review, New York, 1846, pp. 218–228.] Respecting the modifications which occur in later editions of his work, see *Galle*, p. 266, ss., and *Heppe*, 386.—*Zwingle's* views were more mild than those of any of the other reformers upon the subject of original sin; he considered it to be *actual sin* only in a certain sense. Thus in his, Fidei Ratio, addressed to Charles V. (Opera, iv. p. 6): De originali peccato sic sentio: Peccatum vere dicitur, cum contra legem itum est; ubi enim non lex est, ibi non est prævaricatio, et ubi non est prævaricatio, ibi non est peccatum proprie captum, quatenus scilicet peccatum, scelus, crimen, facinus aut reatus est Patrem igitur nostrum peccavisse fateor peccatum, quod vere peccatum est, scelus scilicet, crimen ac nefas. At qui ex isto prognati sunt, non hoc modo peccarunt; quis enim nostrum in paradiso pomum vetitum depopulatus est dentibus? Velimus igitur nolimus, admittere cogimur, peccatum originale, ut est in filiis Adæ, non proprium peccatum esse, quomodo jam expositum est; non enim est facinus contra legem. *Morbus igitur est proprie et conditio*: morbus, quia, sicut ille ex amore sui lapsus est, ita et nos labimur; conditio, quia, sicut ille servus est factus et morti obnoxius, sic et nos servi et filii iræ nascimur et morti obnoxii. (An illustration of a servant, who is made a prisoner of war with his master, but *without guilt of his own.*)

* In this view Luther goes even beyond Augustine; see *Schenkel*, ii. p. 17.

Comp. *Zwingle*, De Peccato originali, ad Urbanum Rhegium, Opera, iii. p. 627, *sq.* Pag. 628: Quid enim brevius aut clarius dici potuit quam originale peccatum non esse peccatum, sed morbum, et Christianorum liberos propter morbum istum non addicti æterno supplicio? Contra vero, quid imbecillius dici potuit et a canonica scriptura alienius, quam....non tantum esse morbum, sed etiam reatum? Pag. 629: Morti autem vocabulo hic.. utimur..quatenus cum vitio conjunctus est, eoque perpetuo, ut genti alicui translatitium est balbutire, cœcutire, podagra laborare. Quod malum naturale defectum solemus germanice *ein natürlichen Bresten* appellare, quo nemo vel pejor vel sceleratior existimatur: non enim possunt in crimen aut culpam rapi, quæ natura adsunt. Si ergo diximus originalem contagionem *morbum* esse, non *peccatum*, quod peccatum cum culpa conjunctum est; culpa vero ex commisso vel admisso ejus nascitur, qui facinus designavit. (Example of one born in slavery.) Compare his work, Vom Kindertouf (Pædobaptism), Werke, ii. 1, p. 287, *sq.*: "Original sin is nothing but a natural defect derived from Adam....such a defect (*Bresten*) as one has by birth, or acquires from any accident." "The difference," says *Schweizer*, i. 46, "of Zwingle's view from the common one is a fact of no great moment" (?). One of the chief differences is this, that Zwingle does not view original sin as *imputed* to man; that original sin, *as such*, is not under *condemnation*. Compare the further passages, and the defence of Zwingle by the Reformed theologians (*e. g. Pictet*), in *Schweizer*, ubi supra, and in *Schenkel*, ii. 29, *sq.* As to the extent to which Zwingle put the essence of sin in the bodily constitution (the flesh), see ibid. 34. At any rate, with all the reformers, he held to the absolute sinfulness and condemnation of man in the sight of God; see his treatise on Divine and Human Justice (Werke, i. 435): "We are all criminal before God....and as our crimes are known to God alone, so He alone judges them....I call human righteousness, a poor defective righteousness, because a man may well be just and esteemed before men, who is not just in the sight of God: for no man is just before God....it is not possible for a man to be inwardly pious, pure and clean, according to divine righteousness." Hence, he is no Pelagian! *Calvin* is here intermediate between Luther and Zwingle. Inst. II. 1, § 6 (ed. Gen. 1550, f.): Non aliter interpretari licet quod dicitur, nos in Adam mortuos esse, quam quod ipse peccando non sibi tantum cladem ac ruinam ascivit, sed naturam quoque nostram in simile præcipitavit exitium. Neque id suo unius vitio, quod nihil ad nos pertineat, sed quoniam universum suum semen ea, in quam lapsus erat vitiositate, infecit....Sic ergo se corrupit Adam, ut ab eo transierit in totam sobolem contagio, etc. § 8: Videtur ergo peccatum originale hereditaria naturæ nostræ pravitas et corruptio in omnes animæ partes diffusa....Quare qui peccatum originale definierunt carentiam justitiæ originalis, quam inesse nobis oportebat, quamquam id totum complectuntur, quod in re est, non tamen satis significanter vim atque energiam ipsius expresserunt. Non enim natura nostra bóni tantum inops et vacua est, sed malorum omnium adeo fertilis et ferax, ut otiosa esse non possit. Qui dixerunt, esse concupiscentiam, non nimis alieno verbo usi sunt, si modo adderetur (quod minime conceditur a plerisque), quidquid in homine est, ab intellectu ad voluntatem, ab anima ad carnem usque, hac concupiscentia inquinatum

refertumque esse, aut, ut brevius absolvatur, *totum hominem non aliud ex se ipso esse quam concupiscentiam.* That sounds like Flacianism; but see also § 11: A natura fluxisse (peccatum) negamus, ut significemus *adventitiam* magis esse qualitatem, quæ homini *acciderit*, quam *substantialem proprietatem*, quam ab initio induerit. Vocamus tamen naturalem, ne quis ab unoquoque prava consuetudine comparari putet, quam hæreditario jure universos comprehensos teneat. §9: Neque enim appetitus tantum eum (Adamum) illexit, sed arcem ipsam mentis occupavit nefanda impietas et ad cor intimum penetravit superbia, ut frigidum sit ac stultum, corruptelam, quæ inde manavit, ad sensuales tantum, ut vocant, motus restringere. Comp. *Schenkel*, ii. 37, *sq.*

[2] As regards *the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church*, see Confessio August. Art. 2: Docent, quod post lapsum Adæ omnes homines, secundum naturam propagati, nascantur cum peccato, h. e. sine metu Dei, sine fiducia erga Deum et cum concupiscentia, quodque hic morbus seu vitium originis vere sit peccatum, damnans et afferens nunc quoque æternam mortem his, qui non renascuntur per baptismum et Spir. S. Damnant Pelagianos et alios, qui vitium originis negant esse peccatum, et, ut extenuent gloriam meriti et beneficiorum Christi, disputant hominem propriis viribus rationis coram Deo justificari posse. Comp. Apol. Art. 1, 5, Art. Smalcald. p. 317: Peccatum hæreditarium tam profunda et tetra est corruptio naturæ, ut nullius hominis ratione intelligi possit, sed ex Scripturæ patefactione agnoscenda et credenda sit. Formula Conc. p. 574: Credimus peccatum originis non esse levem, sed tam profundam humanæ naturæ corruptionem, quæ nihil sanum, nihil incorruptum in corpore et anima hominis, atque adeo in interioribus et exterioribus viribus ejus, reliquit.—According to p. 640, nothing is left to man but impotentia et ineptitudo, *ἀδυναμία* et stupidites, qua homo ad omnia divina seu spiritualia sit prorsus ineptus....In aliis enim externis hujus mundi rebus, quæ rationi subjectæ sunt, relictum est homini adhuc aliquid intellectus, virium et facultatum, etsi hæ etiam miseræ reliquiæ valde sunt debiles, et quidem hæc ipsa quantulacunque per morbum illum hæreditarium veneno infecta sunt atque contaminata, ut coram Deo nullius momenti sint. Respecting *the Symbolical Books of the Reformed Church*, comp. Confess. Basil. I. Art. 2: Man has wilfully committed sin, and by his fall brought corruption upon the whole human race, exposed it to condemnation, weakened our nature, and introduced such a tendency to sin, that if the Holy Spirit does not restore it, man by himself neither will nor can do good. Conf. Helv. II. 8: Peccatum autem intelligimus esse nativam illam hominis corruptionem ex primis nostris parentibus in nos omnes derivatam vel propagatam, qua concupiscentiis pravis immersi et a bono aversi, ad omne vero malum propensi, pleni omni nequitia, diffidentia, contemtu et odio Dei, nihil boni ex nobis ipsis facere, imo ne cogitare quidem possumus. Cap. 9:.... Non sublatus est quidem homini intellectus, *non erepta ei voluntas* et prorsus in lapidem vel truncum est commutatus. Ceterum illa ita sunt immutata et imminuta in homine, ut non possint amplius, quod potuerunt ante lapsum. Intellectus enim obscuratus est, *voluntas vero ex libera facta est voluntas serva.* Nam servit peccato, non nolens sed volens. Etenim voluntas, non noluntas dicitur. *Ergo quoad malum sive peccatum* homo non coactus vel a Deo, vel a Diabolo, sed *sua sponte* malum facit et *hac parte liberrimi est*

arbitrii. . . . Quantum vero ad bonum et ad virtutes, intellectus hominis non recte judicat de divinis ex semet ipso. Heidelberg Catechism, *Qu.* 7: By the fall and disobedience of our first parents our nature has been so corrupted that we are all conceived and born in sins. *Quest.* 8. But are we so corrupt that we are wholly unable to do anything that is good, and inclined to do all that is evil? *Ans.* Yes, unless we be regenerated by the Holy Spirit.* Comp. Conf. Gall. c. 9, Belg. 15: (Peccatum orig.) est totius naturæ corruptio et vitium hæreditarium, quo et ipsi infantes in matris suæ utero polluti sunt, quodque veluti radix omne peccatorum genus in homine producit ideoque ita fœdum et exsecrabile est coram Deo, ut ad generis humani condemnationem sufficiat. Canon. Dord. c. 8, Art. 1, Form. Cons. 10: Censemus igitur, peccatum Adami omnibus ejus posteris, judicio Dei arcano et justo, imputari. 11: Duplici igitur nomine post peccatum homo natura, indeque ab ortu suo, antequam ullum actuale peccatum in se admittat, iræ ac maledictioni divinæ obnoxius est: primum quidem ob *παράπτωμα* et inobedientiam, quam in Adami lumbis commisit; deinde ob consequentem in ipso conceptu hæreditariam corruptionem insitam, qua tota ejus natura depravata et spiritualiter mortua est, adeo quidem, ut recte peccatum originale statuatur duplex, imputatum videlicet et hæreditarium inhærens. [The XXXIX. Articles of the Church of England, Art. 9: Of Original or Birth-sin: Original sin standeth not in the following of *Adam* (as the Pelagians do vainly talk); but in the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of *Adam;* whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerate; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek, *phronema sarkos*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.—The Westminster Confession, chapter vi. 3: They [our first parents] being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this [their first] sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation. Larger Catechism, Qu. 22: The covenant being made with *Adam*, not for himself only, but for his posterity, all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression. Qu. 25. The sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consisteth in the guilt of *Adam's* first sin, the want of that righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually; which is commonly called *original sin*, and from which do proceed all actual transgressions.]

* The Roman Catholics also rejected pure Pelagianism, Conc. Trid. sess. v.

* Concerning the controversies to which this proposition afterwards gave rise, see Beckhaus, l. c. p. 57, (A. D. 1583, it was opposed by the Dutch theologian, Coornhert.)

1, 2....Si quis Adæ prævaricationem sibi soli et non ejus propagini asserit nocuisse, et acceptam a Deo sanctitatem et justitiam, quam perdidit, sibi soli et non nobis etiam cum perdidisse, aut inquinatum illum per inobedientiæ peccatum mortem et pœnas corporis tantum in omne genus humanum transfudisse, non autem et peccatum, quod mors est animæ: anathema sit. Sess. vi. c. 1, it is asserted that the free will of man is, by the fall, weakened and turned aside (attenuatum et inclinatum); on the other hand, it is maintained, in terms quite as decided, Can. 5: Si quis liberum hominis arbitrium post Adæ peccatum amissum et extinctum esse dixerit....anathema sit. Comp. Cat. Rom. 3, 10, 6, and especially *Bellarmine*, De Amiss. Gratiæ.

[4] Apol. Conf. Remonstr., p. 84, b. (quoted by *Winer*, p. 59): Peccatum originale nec habent (Remonstrantes) pro peccato proprie dicto, quod posteros Adami odio Dei dignos faciat, nec pro malo, quod per modum proprie dictæ pœnæ ab Adamo in posteros dimanet, sed pro malo, infirmitate, vitio aut quocunque tandem alio nomine vocetur, quod ab Adamo justitia originali privato in posteros ejus propagatur: unde fit, ut posteri omnes Adami eadem justitia destituti, prorsus inepti et inidonei sint ad vitam æternam consequendum, aut in gratiam cum Deo redeant, nisi Deus nova gratia sua eos præveniat, et vires novas iis restituat ac sufficiat, quibus ad eam possint pervenire....Peccatum autem originis non esse malum culpæ proprie dictæ, quod vocant, ratio manifesta arguit: malum culpæ non est, quia nasci plane involuntarium est, ergo et nasci cum hac aut illa labe, infirmitate, vitio vel malo. Si malum culpæ non est, non potest esse malum pœnæ, quia culpa et pœna sunt relata. Comp. Limborch, Theol. Christ., 3. 4. 4, and other passages quoted by *Winer*, pp. 60, 61.

[5] Cat. Racov. (*Winer*, p. 57), p. 21: Homo morti est obnoxius, quod primus homo apertum Dei mandatum, cui adjuncta fuit mortis comminatio, trangressus fuit. Unde porro factum est, ut universam suam posteritatem secum in eadem mortis jura traxerit, accedente tamen cujusvis in adultioribus proprio delicto, cujus deinde vis per apertam Dei legem, quam homines transgressi fuerant, aucta est.—Cat. Rac., qu. 423 (*Winer*, p. 59): Peccatum originis nullum prorsus est. Nec enim e Scriptura id peccatum originis doceri potest, et lapsus Adæ, cum unus actus fuerit, vin eam, quæ depravare ipsam naturam Adami, multo minus vero posterorum ejus posset, habere non potuit.—*Faust. Socinus*, De Christo Serv., 4, 6. (Opp., ii. p. 226): Falluntur egregie, qui peccatum illud originis imputatione aliqua pro ea parte, quæ ad reatum spectat, contineri autumant, cum omnis reatus ex sola generis propagatione fluat. Gravius autem multo labuntur, qui pro ea parte, quæ ad corruptionem pertinet, ex pœna ipsius delicti Adami illud fluxisse affirmant....Corruptio nostra et ad peccandum proclivitas non ex uno illo delicto in nos propagata est, sed continuatis actibus habitus modo hujus modo illius vitii est comparatus, quo naturam nostram corrumpente ea corruptio deinde per generis propagationem in nos est derivata. Neque vero si Adamus non deliquisset, propterea vel nos a peccatis immunes fuissemus vel in hanc naturæ corruptionem incurrere non potuissemus, dummodo, ut ille habuit, sic nos quoque voluntatem ad malum liberam habuissemus.—Prælect. Theol., c. 4: Cæterum cupiditas ista mala, quæ cum plerisque hominibus nosci dici potest, non ex peccato illo primi parentis manat, sed ex

eo, quod humanum genus, frequentibus peccatorum actibus, habitum peccandi contraxit et seipsum corrupit: quæ corruptio per propagationem in posteros transfunditur. Etenim unum illud peccatum per se, non modo universos posteros, sed ne ipsum quidem Adamum corrumpendi vim habere potuit. Dei vero consilio, in peccati illius pœnam id factum esse, nec usquam legitur, et plane incredibile est, imo impium id cogitare, Deum videlicit omnis rectitudinis auctorem, ulla ratione pravitatis causam esse: quæ tamen pravitas, quatenus, ut dictum est, per propagationem in hominem derivatur, peccatum proprie appellari nequit.... Concludimus igitur, nullum, improprie etiam loquendo, peccatum originale esse, i. e., ex peccato illo primi parentis nullam labem aut pravitatem universo humano generi necessario ingenitam esse sive inflictam quodammodo fuisse, nec aliud malum ex primo illo delicto ad posteros omnes necessario manasse, quam moriendi omnimodam necessitatem, non quidem ex ipsius delicti vi, sed quia, cum jam homo natura mortalis esset, ob delictum illud suæ naturali mortalitati a Deo relictus est, quodque naturale erat, id in delinquentis pœnam prorsus necessarium est factum. Quare qui ex ipso nascuntur, eadem conditione omnes nasci oportet: nihil enim illi ademtum fuit, quod naturaliter haberet, vel habiturus esset.—Comp. Opp. i. p. 334 b: Vita æterna donum Dei est singulare et excellentissimum, quod nihil cum natura hominis commune habet (comp. § 245, Note 6), aut certe ei nulla ratione naturalitur debetur. Ipsius autem hominis perpetua dissolutio ei naturalis est, ut mitissimus existimandus sit Deus, si homini delinquenti eam pœnæ loco constituit. Nam quid illi vel boni aufert, vel mali infert, si eum naturæ ipsius propriæ relinquit, et a se ex terra creatum atque compactum, in terram rursus reverti ac dissolvi sinit. Hoc adeo rationi per se consentaneum est, ut pœna quodammodo dici non possit. Comp. *Fock*, u. s., 498, 654 sq.

§ 247.

ANTAGONISMS WITHIN THE CONFESSIONS THEMSELVES.

But differences of opinion also manifested themselves among theologians belonging to the same denomination. In the Lutheran Church, *Matthias Flacius* carried the Protestant doctrine to an extreme, advancing notions which bordered on heresy; he held that original sin was of the substance of man, while *Victorin Strigel* regarded it only as an *accidens*.[1] Among the theologians of the age of the Reformation there were not wanting, on the other hand, those who held to views that volatilized the essence of sin;[2] and in respect to the doctrine of original sin, some of the later theologians of the Reformed Church, as those of the school of *Saumur*, especially *Joshua de la Place*, manifested a disposition to adopt the milder views of the Arminians.[3] On the other hand, in the Roman Catholic Church, the *Jansenists* returned to the stricter doctrines of Augustine.[4]

[1] Concerning the controversy, see *Planck*, Geschichte des protestantischen Lehrbegriffs, v. 1, p. 285 ss.; the Dissert. of *Otto* and *Twesten* (above § 215

7, 5,): and *Schmid* in Illgens Zeitschrift, 1843, 2. The views of Flacius are principally brought out in the work "Clavis Scripturæ," and the appended treatise, De Peccato Originali; then in the book, De Peccati Originalis Essentia, Basil., 1568. See p. 655: Hoc igitur modo sentio et assero, primarium peccatum originale esse substantiam, quia anima rationalis et præsertim ejus nobilissimæ substantiales potentiæ—nempe intellectus et voluntas—quæ ante erant ita præclare formatæ, ut essent vera imago Dei fonsque omnis justitiæ, honestatis ac pietatis, et plane essentialiter veluti aureæ et gemmeæ, nunc sunt fraude Satanæ adeo prorsus inversæ, ut sint vera ac viva imago Satanæ, et sint veluti stercoreæ, aut potius ex gehennali flamma constantes. See further in *Schenkel*, ii. 44; and *Heppe*, Gesch. d. deutschen Protestantismus, ii. 395 sq. On this point the authors of the Formula Concordiæ expressed themselves as follows, p. 285: Etsi peccatum originale totam hominis naturam, ut spirituale quoddam venenum et horribilis lepra... infecit et corrupit....tamen non unum et idem est corrupta natura seu substantia corrupti hominis, corpus et anima, aut homo ipse a Deo creatus, in quo originale peccatum habitat....et ipsum originale peccatum, quod in hominis natura aut essentia habitat eamque corrumpit. In like manner the body of a person infected with leprosy, and the disease itself, are two different things. The theologians of the Reformed Church also rejected the views of Flacius; see *J. H. Heidegger*, Corpus Theol. Christ. x. 40, (Ed. Tig. 1700, p. 346). This opinion may in its opposition to Pelagianism, be termed *Manicheeism*, inasmuch as it converts the moral element in the idea of sin into a merely physical one; accordingly, Heidegger calls it l. c. manichæismus incrustatus.

[2] Thus *Sebastian Frank* finds the essence of sin in ignorance and folly, and in general, views it in a negative aspect; see *Schenkel*, ii. 60 sq. Similar views were held by *Ochino*, *Thamer*, *Münzer*, and others; ibid., p. 70 sq.

[3] *Joshua Placæus*, Theses Theologicæ de Statu Hom. lapsi ante Gratiam. 1640, and Disput. de Imputatione primi peccati Adami, Salmur, 1655. He only admitted a mediate imputation of the sin of Adam, but not an immediate one; the opposite view was defended in the Formula Consensus. [See above, § 225 *a*, Note 3. *S. J. Baird*, the Elohim Revealed, Phil., 1860, p. 45. Theological Essays from Princeton Review (New York, 1846), pp. 195 sq. *Schweizer*, Central Dogmen, ii. 234 et passim.]

[4] See *Reuchlin*, Port-Royal, p. 342 ss. Appendix, vii. p. 753 ss.

In respect to individual sins, Protestantism rejected their arbitrary classification, after the scholastic style. The real mortal sin, in the Protestant view, is unbelief, which Luther calls the "many-headed, and many-footed rat-king among the sins." (Walch, iv. 1075): *Schenkel*, ii. 73.

In connection with their rigid views concerning the nature and origin of sin, the Protestants could not but reject the notion of *the immaculate conception of the Virgin;* that they for some time retained the predicates—pura et intemerata virgo (Conf. Bas. I.), and others, does not by any means prove that they admitted the doctrine itself: comp. Declaratio Thoruniens. (quoted by *Augusti*, pp. 415 and 416): Omnes homines, solo Christo excepto, in peccato originali concepti et nati sunt, etiam ipsa *sanctissima* Virgo Maria.—But the doctrine in question continued to meet with opposition on the part of Roman Catholic

writers themselves, and neither the Council of Trent, nor Bellarmine, nor some of the later popes (*e. g.* Gregory XV. and Alexander VII.) ventured to determine the point at issue. Comp. *Winer*, p. 57, note 2. *Augusti*, Archæologie III, p. 100. See, however, the next period.

§ 248.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING MAN, IN THEORY AS WELL AS IN PRACTICE.

The anthropology of the Protestant Church was more fully developed both in its practical workings, and by the adherents of the schools. In the spirit of the earlier scholasticism, the Lutheran and Reformed divines alike entered into inquiries respecting the creation of man,[1] the propagation of the human race (Creationism and Traducianism),[2] the nature of the fall,[3] of original sin,[4] and of actual sin.[5] The conscious sense of sin and moral inability, as well as the consciousness of freedom, continued to manifest themselves in practical life; though, in reference to the former, the definitions of the schools, and the bigoted zeal which *Calov* displayed in his controversy with *Calixt* and his followers,[6] hardened it into a dead letter. On the other hand, the *Pietists* again emphasized the importance of the practical bearing of the doctrine concerning the corruption of mankind, and yet insisted none the less upon the strictest injunctions of morality.[7] This was also the case with the *Jansenists* in the Roman Catholic Church,[8] while the Pelagianising principles of the *Jesuits* were favorable to a looser morality.[9]

[1] The assertion that there had been human beings prior to the creation of Adam (*Preadamites*), gave rise to a short controversy in the Reformed Church. *Isaac Peyrerius* (de la Peyrère), a Huguenot, who had become a convert to Romanism, and died A. D. 1676, as one of the priests of the Oratory, published 1655, a work entitled: De Præadamitis. Comp. *Bayle*, Dictionaire, iii. pp. 637, 638. His notion was opposed by *Calov*, iii. p. 1049, who called it "monstrosa opinio;" *Quenstedt*, i. p. 733, ss., and *Hollaz*, p. 406. [See, Isaac la Peyrère, and his book, The Præadamites, in the American Theological Review, Jan., 1861.] The common definition of man, given in the works on systematic theology, was, that he is an animal rationale. Most of the writers adopted the dichotomistic principle, according to which man consists of body and soul. Thus *Hollaz* says, P. i. c. 5, Qu. 6 (p. 410): Homo constat e duabus partibus, anima rationali et corpore organico; other definitions are given by *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 192. —*John Gerhard* thought that man was an image of the Trinity; see his Loci Theol. Tom. iv. loc. ix. § 6. Comp. § 245, note 3, on the image of God. On God's breathing the breath of life into man's nostrils, comp. *Gerhard*, ibid. § 12 (quoted by *De Wette*, Dogmatik, p. 89); Non ex intimo ore suæ essentiæ spirat Deus animam hominis, sicut Spiritum S. ab omni

æternitate intra divinam essentiam Pater cum Filio spirat, sed animam in tempore extra suam essentiam creatam homini inspiravit.

[2] *Luther* taught traducianism, followed by most of the Lutheran divines, with the exception of *Calixt*, De Animæ Creatione. *Gerhard* very properly left it to philosophers (ix. 8, § 118,) to define the modus propagationis; but he himself taught § 116.... Animas eorum, qui ex Adamo et Eva progeniti fuissent, non creatas, neque etiam generatas, sed propagatas fuisse. Similar views were expressed by *Calov*, iii. 1081, and *Hollaz*, i. 5, qu. 9 (pp. 414, 415); Anima humana hodie non immediate creatur, sed mediante semine fœcundo a parentibus generatur et in liberos traducitur.... Non generatur anima *ex* traduce, sine semine fœcundo, tamquam principio materiali, sed *per* traducem, seu mediante semine prolifico tamquam vehiculo, propagatur.—Comp. the Consensus Repetitus Fidei veræ Luth., Punct. 22 (in *Henke*, p. 18): Profitemur et docemus, hominem generare hominem, idque non tantum quoad corpus, sed etiam animam. Rejicimus eos, qui docent, in hominibus singulis animas singulas non ex propagine oriri, sed ex nihilo tunc primum creari atque infundi, cum in uteris matrum fœtus concepti atque ad animationem præparati sunt.—On the contrary, *Bellarmine*, *Calvin*, and the theologians of the Reformed Church in general, advocated the theory of Creationism, retaining at the same time the doctrine of original sin. Calvin, indeed, did not attach so much importance to such statements as the earlier scholastics (Instit. II. 1, 7): Neque ad ejus rei intelligentiam necessaria est anxia disputatio, quæ veteres non parum torsit; but he continued as follows: Neque in substantia carnis aut animæ causam habet contagio; sed quia a Deo ita fuit ordinatum. *Beza* rejects traducianism in the most decided manner, Qu. 47: Doctrina de animæ traduce mihi perabsurda videtur, quoniam aut totam animam aut partem ejus traduci oporteret.—Comp. *Peter Martyr*, Thesis 705: Animæ non sunt omnes simul creatæ ab initio, sed creantur quotidie a Deo corporibus inserendæ.—*Polanus*, p. 2183: Eodem momento Deus creat animam simul et unit corpori infecto.—*Bucanus*, p. 92: Quod totum genus humanum ab Adamo corruptum est, non tam ex genitura provenit.... quam ex justa Dei vindicta. Other passages are quoted by *De Wette*, Dogmatik, p. 89. *Schweizer*, i. 452, *sq.*

[3] The fall of our first parents was called peccatum originans, in distinction from original sin (peccatum originale, originatum). The causa externa, prima et principalis, was Satan, the causa instrumentalis was the serpent, by which we are to understand a real serpent possessed with the devil. *Gerhard*, Loc. x. § 8, p. 295, endeavors to reconcile the too literal interpretation of Josephus (Antiq. 3 [1]), with the allegorising exposition of Philo (De Mundi Opif. f. 46) by saying: Nos nec nudum, nec mere allegoricum, sed diabolo obsessum ac stipatum serpentem hic describi statuimus. (He proves this at some length from the twofold nature of the serpent, and the curse pronounced upon the devil no less than upon the serpent.) Compare the passages from other theologians in *De Wette*, p. 94, and in *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 202.—The Reformed theologians entered into similar investigations. This was the case, *e. g.* with *Heidegger*, x. 10. In ch. 14, he describes the *μεθοδεία* tentationis sataniæ, and then proceeds (in the subsequent chapters, especially ch. 18) to measure out the guilt of man. Adam's fall

was not particularis, but generalis.... Non simplex, sed concatenatum peccatum fuit, et universæ legis, amoris Dei et proximi violationem involvit. He transgressed the laws both of the first and second table. His guilt was considerably increased, partly because, having received so many blessings from the hand of God, he could have no inducement to sin, partly because the command was in itself easy to be complied with. Other circumstances also, such as time and place (*i. e.* his recent creation and his abode in paradise), added to his guilt, as well as his high office in his capacity as the father of the human race. Accedit, quod (peccatum Adæ) radix fuit omnium peccatorum et velut equus Trojanus, ex cujus utero et iliis innumera peccata omniumque malorum Ilias prodierunt, ut gravissimum hoc peccatum et apostasiam a Deo vivente fuisse, dubitari nullo modo possit. In ch. 19, he examines (after the example of the scholastics) the question, whether Adam had the greater guilt, or Eve? which he thus decides: Nobis Scriptura utcunque innuere videtur, gravius peccasse Adamum, cum non tam Evæ, quam Adami peccatum accuset (Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22). In ch. 20 he treats of the share which God had in the fall: Nec Deus spectator otiosus fuit. Nam *ante* peccatum tum lege illud vetuit, tum comminatione ab eo hominem deterruit. *In* peccato et explorationis causa hominem sibi reliquit, et patrato jam ab Eva peccato, oculos ejusdem ad agnoscendam nuditatem prius non aperuit, quam Adam etiam peccasset. *Post* illud immediate judicium in peccatores exercuit....et in remedium peccati Christum *προκεχειροτονημένον* revelavit. Nevertheless he modestly adds: In modo, quem divina providentia circa peccatum adhibuit explicando cogitationes et linguæ nostræ ita frænandæ sunt, ut cogitemus semper Deum in cœlo esse, nos in terra, eum fabricatorem esse, nos ejus plasma. Cumque intelligere, quomodo creati simus, non valeamus, multo equidem minus intelligere possumus, quomodo facti ad imaginem Dei mutari potuerimus, *ut tamen non independenter homo egerit, et Deus malum non fecerit.* Comp. *Gerhard*, § 14, ss., § 25: Maneat ergo firmum fixum, Deum non decrevisse nec voluisse istum protoplastorum lapsum, nec impulisse eos ad peccatum, nec eo delectatem fuisse, etc.

[4] *Gerhard*, Loci, x. c. 3, ss. § 51: Per hominem victum tota natura corrupta est et quasi fermentata peccato.—§ 52: Peccatum illud (Adami) non est modis omnibus a nobis alienum, quia Adam non ut privatus homo, sed ut caput totius humani generis peccavit; atque ut natura humana per ipsum communicata fit propria cuique personæ ex ipso genitæ, sic et naturæ corruptio per propagationem communicatur. Ac proinde quemadmodum tribus Levitica inclusa lumbis Abrahæ decimas obtulisse Melchisedecho dicitur (Hebr. vii. 9), ita et nos, qui in lumbis Adæ peccantis delituimus, in et cum ipso non modo corrupti, sed et rei iræ Dei facti sumus. His views are more fully developed, c. 5.—According to *Heidegger*, x. 44, ss., not only the *potentiæ naturales* (superiores: mens et voluntas; inferiores: sensitiva et vegetativa) are subject to corruption, but also the *qualitates:* conscience itself has become erring, and the bodily organs are affected by the general corruption (Matt. v. 29, 30). Concerning the nature of original sin it is said, c. 50: Neque peccatum originale merus reatus peccati alieni, neque concupiscentia sola proprie, neque nuda justitiæ carentia est. Sed *late* ac-

ceptum peccati alieni imputatione, et labe omnibus facultatibus inhærente, easque tum a bono avertente, tum ad malum convertente, quam utramque distinctus reatus sequitur; *stricte* vero pro solo eo, quod nascentibus seu orientibus inest, labe ea facultatibus insita, quam etiam proprius reatus sequitur, constat. Cum enim peccatum pertineat ad facultates hominis, ab iis non est discedendum. Itaque cum peccatum originis non pertineat ad opera, quæ a facultatibus illis procedunt, neque est in ipsis illis, ceu spiritualis quædam lepra hæreat. For the views of other Reformed divines, see *Schweizer*, p. 54, *sq.*

[5] Sin was defined as—illegalitas seu difformitas a lege divina, or as—defectus vel inclinatio vel actio pugnans cum lege Dei, offendens Deum, damnata a Deo, et faciens reos æternæ iræ et æternarum pœnarum, nisi si facta remissio. By the *contingence* of sin was understood the (abstract) possibility of its being or not being, in distinction from (physical) necessity. A distinction was made between peccatum originale (habituale) and actuale; and actual sins were further divided into peccata voluntaria et involuntaria, peccata commissionis et omissionis,* peccata interiora et exteriora, or, peccata cordis, oris et operis, etc. Comp. *Gerhard*, Loci, Tom. v. ab. initio. *Heidegger*, c. 52, ss., and other passages quoted by *De Wette*, l. c.

[6] The views of *Calixt*, which he held at an early period of his life, were laid down in a collected form in his Dissertat. de Peccato (written A. D. 1611); see G. Calixti de præcipuis christianæ Religionis Capitibus Disputationes XV., ed. a *F. U. Calixto*, Helmst., 1658, 4, Disput. V. He combated Traducianism (comp. note 2), and deduced from it the following positions: Thes. 33: Quare peccatum originis in nobis non est ipsa culpa a parentibus commissa, et quia culpa non est, nec est reatus, quum aperte quoque scriptum sit (Ezech. xviii. 20): Filius non portabit iniquitatem patris, si videlicet ipsa eam non adprobet aut imitetur.—Thes. 56: Vera et sincera est sententia, quam proposuimus, quod scilicet peccatum originis non sit ipsa culpa Adæ, nec sit reatus consequens culpam, verum pravitas naturæ, non tamen sine relatione ad primam culpam, cujus est tamquam effectus immediate consequens.... Hæret itaque in nobis aliquid, et peccatum originale dicitur, quod non est ipsa illa prima Adæ prævaricatio, sed aliquid aliud ab ipsa manans. Thes. 57: Optime autem cognoscitur ex opposita integritate, quæ sicuti in intellectua erat cognitio, in voluntate amor et pronitas ad benefaciendum, in adpetitu obsequium et concordia cum superioribus facultatibus, ita pravitas hæc in intellectu est ignorantia, in voluntate pronitas ad malefaciendum, in adpetitu rebellio. Thes. 58: Et sicuti in integritate sive ad imaginem Dei conditus erat homo, ita nunc in pravitate sive ad imaginem Adæ gignitur. Thes. 59: Et sicuti homo si non peccasset, integritas naturam humanam semper et inseparabiliter consequuta fuisset, et una cum illa ad posteros propagata, ita, postquam homo peccavit, pravitas eam concomitatur et propagatur. Thes. 60: Et sicuti integritas fuisset tamquam actus primus, actus autem secundus ex illo primo natus, studium et exercitium integritatis, ita nunc pravitas ista connata est actus primus, actus autem

* There were special investigations about the *Sin against the Holy Ghost*, as being "tristissima species peccati mortalis. *Gerhard*, Loci Theol., v p. 84. *Quenstedt*, ii. p. 80 *Gass*, p. 360

secundus est pravitas pravum actum producens. Thes. 93, (in which he opposes Flacius) he says: Pejor autem hæresis quam Manichæorum, adserere substantiam humanam esse peccatum, et hanc nihilominus a Deo propagari et conservari. Ita enim peccatum a Deo propagabitur et conservabitur, et Deus O. M. auctor peccati constituetur. In Thes. 88, and in some other places, Calixt maintained (like *Strigel*) that original sin is an *accidens*.—*Lakermann* (who lived in Königsberg from 1644–46), a disciple of Calixt, asserted in one of his theses—quod gratia Dei ita offertur, ut, ea oblata, in hominis potestate sit, per illam ea, quæ ad conversionem et salutem necessaria sint, præstare; in another: Omnes, si velint, possunt se convertere; further: Solum peccatum originale post lapsum adæquata causa damnationis esse non potest. Such sentiments were in the opinion of Prof. *Mislenta*, grossly and dangerously erroneous. Thus the signal was given for a general controversy, in which *Calixt* himself, and his colleague *Conrad Hornejus*, took part. In consequence of the efforts made by *Calov*, the views of Calixt and his adherents were condemned (A. D. 1655) in the Consensus Repetitus Fidei veræ Lutheranæ, in which the Lutheran doctrine of original sin was set forth in the most rigid terms. Thus, in particular, Punct. 23–29 (in *Henke*, p. 18 sq.). For the passages see *Neudecker* (Fortsetzung von *Münscher*, ed. by *Von Cölln*) p. 440. On the controversy in general, comp. *Planck*, Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie, p. 107 ss. *Gass*, Georg Calixt und der Synkretismus, 1846, p. 68 ss., p. 98. [*Schmid*, Gesch. der Synkret. Streitigkeiten, 1846. *Baur*, d. Calixt. Synkretismus, in Theol. Jahrbücher, vii. *Henke*, Calixtus und seine Zeit, 1853–60. Gieseler, Church Hist. (New York ed.),; v.§ 52.]

[7] In the case of *Spener*, as in that of Luther, personal experience led him to the knowledge of sin, and moulded his views concerning its nature; thus it happened that in his system *sin* and *repentance* are closely connected with each other. He does not wait till his views of sin become cold and indifferent, but he strikes, as it were, the iron made red-hot in the furnace of inward experience while it retains its heat. Compare his Theologische Bedenken (edit. by *Hennicke*), p. 33 ss.—Nor, when he published (1687) his first treatise, in Saxony, under the title "Natur und Gnade," was it his intention to present a theoretical contrast between nature and grace in a scientific way; but his object being practical, he adopted popular forms of statement, and did not present the antagonism in all its sharpness. See *Hossbach*, i. 257. But even his very zeal for sanctification was represented, and opposed, by the orthodox, as a perversion of sound doctrine.

[8] Both Pietism and Jansenism prove that the system of Augustine, though often charged with enfeebling the moral power of man, nevertheless produces deeper and more lasting effects than Pelagianism; and that the charge of its undermining morality and paralysing the will, cannot be admitted, at least in that universality of application in which it is commonly advanced. The motto of Jansenism here holds good: Dei servitus, vera libertas.

[9] Compare Pascal's Lettres Provinciales. *Reuchlin*, Port-Royal, p. 33, ss. 831 ss.

B. THE DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION.

§ 249.

FREEDOM AND GRACE. PREDESTINATION. (ACCORDING TO THE DIFFERENT CONFESSIONS.)

[*Schweizer* Glaubenslehre der Reform. Kirche, 1844, and Central Dogmen, 1854. *Ebrard*, Das Verhältniss d. reform. Dogmatik zum Determinismus, 1849, and *Schweizer*, in reply, in the Tübinger Zeitschrift, 1851. *Heppe*, Dogmatik der evangel. Ref. Kirche, 1861. *J. B. Mozley*, Doctrine of Predestination, 1855; comp. Christian Remembrancer, and Dublin Review, 1856. *Moses Stuart*, on Calvin and Arminius, in Biblical Repository, i., 1834. Bp. *Davenant*, De Prædestinatione, 1630, fol. *Owen's* works, vols. x., xi. *Julius Mühler* in Studien u. Kritiken, 1856; that Calvin's doctrine had a religious, and not a speculative basis. Calvin's Prädestinationslehre, in *Schaff's* Kirchenfreund, 1853. *Bartels*, Die Prädestinationslehre in Ostfriesland (John a Lasco), in Zeitschrift f. deutsche Theologie, 1860. *J. A. L. Hebart*, Die Prädest. lehre d. Concordienformel, in Zeitschrift f. d. Luth. Theologie, 1861. *Philippi*, Luther's Lehre von d. Prädestination, in Theol. Zeitschrift, 1860.]

Notwithstanding the many religious conflicts to which the Reformation gave rise, Christians of all denominations agreed in the general belief, that the salvation of man depends on the gracious purpose of God.[1] But they differed on the questions, whether the Divine decree, which has reference to this point, is unconditional, or depends on the conduct of man, whether it is general or particular. The more rigid the views of theologians on the doctrine of original sin, and the moral inability of man, the more firmly they would maintain that the decrees of God are unconditional. Hence it is not surprising that Roman Catholics,[2] Arminians,[3] and most of all the Socinians,[4] endeavoured in a more or less Pelagian manner, to satisfy the claims of human freedom. On the other hand, both Lutherans and Reformed, following Augustine, rejected the notion of the freedom of the will, and denied all co-operation on the part of man.[5] Nevertheless, it is a striking fact, that the Lutherans avoided the strict consequences of the Augustinian system, and asserted that the decrees of God are conditional;[6] while the Reformed theologians not only admitted the necessity of those consequences,[7] but, having once determined the idea of predestination, went beyond the premises so far as to maintain, that the fall of man itself was predestinated by God (*Supralapsarianism.*)[8] But this view so far from meeting with general approbation, was at last almost entirely abandoned to make way for its opposite (*Infralapsarianism*).[9] As regards the extent of the offered grace, all the confessions, with the exception of the Reformed, held to universalism,[10] in distinction from particularism; but even all Calvinists did not on this point proceed to the same length;[11] some of them adopted the stand-

point of the universality of the provisions of grace. [The Westminster Assembly set forth the doctrines of sin and redemption, so as to harmonise the conflicting views about freedom and grace; the scheme of absolute predestination was here modified by the theory of the covenants.][12]

[1] Compare the passages quoted by *Winer*, pp. 80, 81.

[2] Conc. Trid. Sess. vi., can. 4: Sicut quis dixerit, liberum arbitrium a Deo motum et excitatum nihil cooperari assentiendo Deo excitanti atque vocanti, quo ad obtinendam justificationis gratiam se disponat ac præparet, neque posse dissentire, si velit, sed velut inanime quoddam nihil omnino agere, mereque passive se habere: anathema sit.—Can. 17: Si quis justificationis gratiam nonnisi prædestinatis ad vitam contingere dixerit, reliquos vero omnes, qui vocantur, vocari quidem, sed gratiam non accipere, utpote divina potestate prædestinatos ad malum: anathema sit. The doctrine of the Roman Catholic Symbols was in so far decidedly opposed to the Pelagians, as the former maintained (Sess. 6, can. 3) that it is *God* who begins the work of conversion without any co-operation on the part of man; but they also asserted that afterwards the freewill must be added, and man co-operate in the work of sanctification.—For further passages, see *Winer*, p. 84. *Bellarmine* advances the following proposition (in opposition to Pelagians, etc.), at the very commencement of his treatise: de Gratia et lib. Arbitr.: Auxilium gratiæ Dei non ita offertur omnibus hominibus, ut Deus expectet homines, qui illud desiderent vel postulent, sed prævenit omnia desideria et omnem invocationem. In ch. 2, he then proceeds to assert: Auxilium gratiæ Dei non æqualiter omnibus adest. Thus far he agrees with the Protestants. He even adds, in ch. 3: Nulla esset in Deo iniquitas, si non solum aliquibus, sed etiam omnibus hominibus auxilium sufficiens ad salutem negaret. He likewise in ch. 4, gives the practical caution (after the example of Augustine), not to doubt aforehand the salvation of any one, but to persevere in admonishing, etc. But in ch. 5, he converts this practical advice into the doctrinal theory: Auxilium sufficiens ad salutem pro loco et tempore, meditate vel immediate omnibus datur (a proposition which is somewhat limited and more fully discussed in the subsequent chapters). And then in the sequel (in Books ii. and iii) he endeavours to save the doctrine of free will. In his view, free will is not the condition of being free, but the power of choosing, and of forming purposes. It is neither actus nor habitus, but potentia, and, in specie, potentia activa. On the co-operation of the free will with the grace of God, he says, iv. c. 15: Hinc sequitur, ut neque Deus determinet sive necessitet voluntatem, neque voluntas Deum. Nam et uterque concursum suum libere adhibet, et si alter nolit concurrere, opus non fiet. Simile est, cum duo ferunt ingentem lapidem, quem unus ferre non posset; neuter enim alteri vires addit, aut eum impellit, et utrique liberum est onus relinquere. Quamquam Deus, nisi extrordinarie miraculum operari velit, semper concurrit, quando voluntas nostra concurrit, quoniam ad hoc se libere quodam modo obligavit, quando liberam voluntatem creavit. Ex quo etiam sequitur, ut, licet in eodem prorsus momento temporis et naturæ Deus et voluntas operari incipiant, tamen Deus operetur, quia voluntas operatur, non con

tra. Et hoc est, quod aliqui dicunt, voluntatem prius natura operari quam Deum, non prioritate instantis *in* quo, sed *a* quo.—*Concerning Predestination*, he expresses himself as follows, ibid., p. 657: Deus ab æterno determinavit omnes effectus, sed non ante prævisionem determinationis causarum secundarum, præsertim contingentium et liberarum, et rursus determinavit omnes effectus, sed non eodem modo: alios enim determinavit futuros se operante vel cooperante, alios se permittente, vel non impediente, etc.—Ib., p. 659: Deus, qui perfecte cognoscit omnes propensiones et totum ingenium animi nostri, et rursum non ignorat omnia, quæ illi possunt occurrere in singulis deliberationibus, et denique perspectum habet, quid majus congruum et aptum sit, moveat talem animum tali propensione et ingenio præditum, infallibiliter colligit, quam in partem animus sit inclinaturus.

[3] "*The Arminians suppose a constant cooperation of the human will, awakened by divine grace, with that grace; but in their opinion the influence of the latter is by no means merely of a moral nature; it is the power of the Holy Spirit accompanying the Word of God* (Confess. Remonstr., 17, 2, 5), *which exerts an influence upon the mind, and is supernatural as regards its nature, but analogous to the natural power of all truth, as regards the mode of its operation.*" *Winer*, p. 86, where passages are quoted from the Confess., and Apol. Confess. Remonstr. [Comp. *Stuart*, in Bibl. Repos., i., as cited above.] Comp. also *Episcopii* Institutt., v., p. 5 ss. *Limborch*, Theol. Christ., Lib. iv., ab init., cap. 12, § 15: Concludimus itaque, quod gratia divina, per Evangelium nobis revelata, sit principium, progressus et complementum omnis salutaris boni, sine cujus cooperatione nullum salutare bonum ne cogitare quidem, multo minus perficere, possimus.—Cap. 14, § 21;..... Gratia Dei primaria est fidei causa, sine qua non posset homo recte libero arbitrio uti. Perinde est, ac si duobus captivis carceri inclusis, et vinculis et compedibus arte constrictis, quidam superveniat, qui carcerem aperiat, vincula demat, et egrediendi facultatem largiatur, quin et manu apprehensa eos suaviter trahat et hortetur ut exeant: unus autem occasione hac commoda utatur, libertatemque oblatam apprehendat et e carcere egrediatur; alter vero beneficium istud liberationis contemnat et in carcere manere velit; nemo dicet illum libertatis suæ esse causam, non vero eum qui carcerem aperuit, eo quod aperto carcere, perinde uti alter, non egredi et in captivitate remanere potuit. Dices: Ergo liberum arbitrium, *cooperatur* cum gratia? Resp.: Fatemur, alias nulla obedientia aut inobedientia hominis locum habet. Dices: An cooperatio liberi arbitrii non est bonum salutare? Resp.: Omnino. Dices: Ergo gratia non est primaria causa salutis? Resp.: Non est *solitaria*, sed tamen *primaria*; ipsa enim liberi arbitrii cooperatio est a gratia tamquam primaria causa: nisi enim a præveniente gratia liberum arbitrium excitatum esset, gratiæ cooperari non posset. Dices: Qui potestatem habet credendi, non salvatur, sed qui actu credit: cum itaque prius tantum sit a Deo, posterius a nobis, sequitur, nos nostri salvatores esse. Respondeo 1. Quonium sine potestate credendi actu credere non possumus, sequitur eum, qui credendi potestatem largitus est, etiam actus fidei primariam esse causam. Unde et in Scriptura uni gratiæ plerumque fides et conversio nostra adscribi solet: quia ....solenne est, opera magna et eximia adscribi causæ principali, minus principalium nulla sæpe mentione facta. Quod et hic usu venit, ut homo

semper beneficii divini memor agnosceret se nullas ex seipso ad tantum bonum consequendum vires habere. Non tantum enim quod possimus velle, sed et quod actu velimus, gratiæ debetur, quæ nos prævenit, excitat et impellit ad volendum et agendum, ita tamen, ut possimus non velle. 2. Certo sensu concedi potest, hominem sui ipsius servatorem esse, Scriptura ipsa ab ejusmodi loquendi ratione non abhorrente. Phil. ii. 12.

[4] *Sebastian Frank*, *Servetus*, and others, were the forerunners of this tendency; see *Schenkel*, Wesen des Protest. ii. 96, *sq.* But it was the *Socinians* whose views chiefly savoured of Pelagianism. Comp. Cat. Racov. qu. 422: Estne liberum arbitrium situm in nostra potestate, ut Deo obtemperemus? Prorsus. Etenim certum est, primum hominem ita a Deo conditum fuisse, ut libero arbitrio præditus esset. Nec vero ulla causa subest, cur Deus post ejus lapsum illum eo privaret. Other passages are given by *Winer*. Comp. also *F. Socinus*, Prælect. Theol. c. 5, and De libero Hom. Arbitrio deque æterna Dei Prædestinatione, scriptum *J. J. Grynæo* oblatum (Opp. i. pp. 780, 781). *Joh. Crellii* Ethica Christ. (Bibl. Fratr. Pol.) p. 262. The Socinians, like the Pelagians, supposed divine grace to consist especially in the external institutions of God, not excluding its internal effects upon the mind. Cat. Rac. qu. 428–30: Auxilium divinum duplex est, interius et exterius. (Exterius aux. div.) sunt promissa et minæ, quorum tamen promissa vim habent longe majorem. Unde etiam, quod sint sub novo fœdere longe præstantiora promissa, quam sub vetere fuerint, facilius est sub novo, quam sub vetere fœdere voluntatem Dei facere. (Interius auxil. div.) est id, cum Deus in cordibus eorum, qui ipsi obediunt, quod promisit (vitam æternam) obsignat.—Pag. 251 (in the revised edition): Spir. S. ejusmodi Dei afflatus est, quo animi nostri vel uberiore rerum divinarum notitia vel spe vitiæ æternæ certiore atque adeo gaudio ac gustu quodam futuræ felicitatis aut singulari adore complentur. For further passages see *Winer*. Socinus thought assisting grace necessary, because the will of most men is weakened (not on account of Adam, but because of their own frequent transgressions); comp. the treatise mentioned above. He rejected the doctrine of predestination, as destructive of all true religion; comp. Prælect. Theol. c. 6 ss. *Fock*, u. s. 662, *sq.*

[5] As early as the disputation of Leipsic, *Luther* compared man to a saw, which is a passive instrument in the hand of the carpenter; see *Möhler*, Symbolik, p. 106. Comp. Comment. in Genes. c. 19: In spiritualibus et divinis rebus, quæ ad animæ salutem spectant, homo est instar statuæ salis, in quam uxor Patriarchæ Loth est conversa; imo est similis trunco et lapidi, statuæ vita carenti, quæ neque oculorum, oris aut ullorum sensuum cordisque usum habet.—But it was especially in his treatise: De Servo Arbitrio, against Erasmus, that he expressed himself in the strongest terms; the many instances in which God exhorts man to keep his commandments, appeared to him ironical, as if a father were to say to his child: "Come,' while he knows that he cannot come (see *Galle*, Melancthon, p. 270, note; *Schenkel*, ii. 81, *sq.*) In respect to predestination, see his letter to an anonymous person (No. 2622 in *De Wette*) (*Seidemann*), vi. p. 427: Per Christum certi facti sumus, omnem credentem a Patre esse prædestinatum. Omnem enim prædestinavit, etiam vocavit per evangelium, *ut credat* et per fidem jus-

tificetur.... Nam verum est, Deum aliquos ex hominibus aliis rejectis ad æternam vitam elegisse et destinasse antequam jacerentur fundamenta mundi. Sed quia Deus in abscondito habitat et judicia ejus occulta sunt, non licet nobis tantam profunditatem assequi.—*Melancthon* also advanced more rigid views in the first edition of his Loci, than in the subsequent ones. Comp. *Galle*, p. 247–326.—In accordance with these views the Confession of Augsburg asserts, c. 18: De libero arbitrio docent, quod humana voluntas habeat aliquam libertatem ad efficiendam civilem justitiam et deligendas res rationi subjectas. Sed non habet vim sine Spiritu Sancto efficiendæ justitiæ Dei seu justitiæ spiritualis, quia animalis homo non percipit ea, quæ sunt Spiritus Dei (1 Cor. ii. 14), sed hæc fit in cordibus, cum per verbum Spir. S. concipitur.—Similar principles were set forth in the symbols of the Reformed churches; comp. Conf. Helv. I. Art. 9, ii. 9: Proinde nullum est ad bonum homini arbitrium liberum, nondum renato, vires nullæ ad perficiendum bonum, etc. (for the other symbols see *Winer*, pp. 81, 82.)—The change which took place in the opinions of Melancthon gave rise to the *synergistic* controversy, see Planck, iv. p. 584, ss., *Galle*, p. 326, ss. [Comp. *Gieseler*, Church Hist. iv. pp. 444, *sq.*] It is declared in the Refutation which was published, Jena, 1557, p. 36, b. (quoted by *Planck*, p. 598): Fugiamus ac detestemur dogma eorum, qui argute philosophantur, mentem et voluntatem hominis in conversione seu renovatione, esse *σύνεργον* seu causam concurrentum, cum et Deo debitum honorem eripiat, et suos defensores, ut Augustinus inquit, magis præcipitet ac temeraria confidentia labefactet, quam stabiliat. The same doctrine is propounded in the Formula Concordiæ, p. 662: Antequam homo per Spir. S. illuminatur, convertitur, regeneratur et trahitur, ex sese et propriis naturalibus suis viribus in rebus spiritualibus et ad conversionem aut regenerationem suam, nihil inchoare, operari aut cooperari potest, nec plus quam lapis, truncus aut limus. On the further dogmatic statements, see *Heppe*, p. 426.

[6] The Formula Concordiæ, p. 617–619, endeavors to avoid this difficulty, by drawing a distinction between prædestinatio et præscientia: Præscientia enim Dei nihil aliud est, quam quod Deus omnia noverit, antequam fiant. .... Hæc præscientia Dei simul ad bonos et malos pertinet, sed interim non est causa mali, neque est causa peccati, quæ hominem ad scelus impellat.... Neque hæc Dei præscientia causa est, quod homines pereant; hoc enim sibi ipsis imputare debent. Sed præscientia Dei disponit malum, et metas illi constituit, quousque progredi et quamdiu durare debeat, idque eo dirigit, ut, licet per se malum sit, nihilominus electis Dei ad salutem cedat.... Prædestinatio vero seu æterna Dei electio tantum ad bonos et dilectos filios Dei pertinet, et hæc est causa ipsorum salutis. Etenim eorum salutem procurat et ea, quæ ad ipsam pertinent, disponit. Super hanc Dei prædestinationem salus nostra ita fundata est, ut inferorum portæ eam evertere nequeant. Hæc Dei prædestinatio non in arcano Dei consilio est scrutanda, sed in verbo Dei, in quo revelatur, quærenda est.—Such definitions were the consequences of the controversy with the Calvinists. It was occasioned by the controversy of two theologians of Strasburg, *John Marbach* and *Jerome Zanchius*, the former of whom belonged to the Lutheran, the latter to the Reformed Church; see *Planck*, vi. p. 809. [Comp. the Doctrine about Predestination,

from Zanchius, etc., in Toplady's Letter to Wesley, reprinted, New York, 1811.]

[1] Among the confessions of faith composed prior to the time of Calvin, the first Confession of Basle declares, Art. 1: "Therefore we confess that God, before the creation of the world, did elect all those to whom he will give the inheritance of eternal blessedness;" yet it is remarkable that this statement is not made in connection with the doctrine of original sin, but in the very first article, that respecting God. The same is the case with *Zwingle*, who pronounced decidedly in favor of predestination, Ad Carolum Imp. Fidei Ratio (Opp. ii. p. 539): Constat autem et firma manet Dei electio: quos enim ille elegit ante mundi constitutionem, sic elegit, ut per filium suum sibi cooptaret: ut enim benignus et misericors, ita sanctus et justus est, etc. He unfolds his views in order in his work De Providentia Dei (Opera, iv. p. 79, *sq.*). The sin of Adam, he says, was included in the predestination, but also redemption. Comp. p. 109, *sq.* Pag. 113: Est electio libera divinæ voluntatis de beandis constitutio.... Quemadmodum legislatoribus ac principibus integrum est constituere ex æqui bonique ratione, sic divinæ majestatis integrum est ex natura sua, quæ ipsa bonitas est, constituere. Pag. 115: In destinandis ad salutem hominibus voluntas divina prima vis est: ancillantur autem sapientia, bonitas, justitia et ceteræ dotes, quo fit, ut voluntati referatur, non sapientiæ....non justitiæ, non liberalitati divinæ....Est igitur electio libera, sed non cœca, divinæ voluntatis, sed non solius quantumvis præcipuæ causæ, constitutio eum majestate et auctoritate, de beandis, non de damnandis. Pag. 140: Stat electio Dei firma et immota, etiamsi per filium suum præcepit, electos ad se transferre....Firma manet electio, etiamsi electus in tam immania scelera prolabatur, qualia impii et repudiati designant....Testes sunt David, Paulus, Magdalena, latro, alii.—Against the practical inference, that the elect will not be harmed, sin as they may, *Zwingle* responds (ibid.): Qui sic loquuntur, testimonium dant, aut se electos non esse, aut fidem ac Dei cognitionem nondum habere.... Omnia cooperantur electis ad bonum; omnia quoque circum illos divina providentia fiunt, neque quicquam tam frivolum fit, quod in Dei ordinatione ac opere frivolum sit. Pag. 143: Hoc omnino irrefragabile est, aut providentiam omnia curare, nuspiam cessare aut torpere, aut omnino nullam esse. For further particulars see *Hahn* in the Studien und Kritiken, 1837, part 4, p. 765, ss.; and on the other side *J. J. Herzog*, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1839, part 4, p. 778, ss.—*Schweizer*, ii. 192; *Schenkel*, ii. 386.—From a comparison instituted between Zwingle's doctrine of predestination, and his general views on original sin and the salvation of the heathen (which differed from rigid Augustinianism), thus much is evident, that he inferred the doctrine of predestination rather from his doctrine respecting God than from his anthropology, and proceeded from speculative rather than from ethical principles. But this by no means implies that he bordered upon pantheistic views.—*Calvin* brought the doctrine of predestination into closer connection with that of original sin, Instit. III. c. 21–24. Thus he says, c. 23: Iterum quæro: Unde factum est, *ut tot gentes una cum liberis eorum infantibus æternæ morti involveret lapsus Adæ* absque remedio, nisi quia Deo ita visum est? Hic obmutescere oportet tam dicaces alioqui linguas. Decretum qui-

dem *horribile* fateor; inficiari tamen nemo poterit, quin præsciverit Deus, quem exitum esset habiturus homo, antequam ipsum conderet, et ideo præsciverit, quia decreto suo sic ordinarat. And in the second Confess. Helvet. the articles concerning the fall of man (8), and concerning the freedom of the will (9), precede, in the order of subjects, that concerning predestination (10). Comp. also Conf. Gall. Art. 12. Belg. Art. 16. Canon. Dordr. i. 1, etc., quoted by *Winer;* see note 11.

[8] Inst. III. c. 23, § 7, he terms the exclusion of the fall of the first man from the divine predestination, a *frigidum commentum*. Comp. § 4: Quum ergo in sua corruptione pereunt (homines), nihil aliud quam pœnas luunt ejusdem calamitatis, *in quam ipsius prædestinatione lapsus est Adam* ac posteros suos præcipites secum traxit.—It is on this particular point that *Calvin* (and his disciple *Beza**) went further than Augustine, who did not include the fall of Adam in the divine decrees. Calvin infers the doctrine of predestination *both* from ethico-anthropological *and* from theologico-speculative premises; in his opinion it has a practical as well as a theoretical aspect. [But compare *Julius Müller* in his essay in the Studien und Kritiken, referred to in the introduction to this section.] The name *Supralapsarians*, however, does not occur prior to the Synod of Dort. It was especially the *Gomarists* who were favorable to the supralapsarian scheme.† "Though the Synod of Dort hesitated to declare in favor of Supralapsarianism, yet this was, at any rate, the inmost sense of orthodoxy;" *Schweizer*, ii. p. 124. [*Baur*, Dogmengeschichte, p. 280: "The genuine Protestant antagonism to Catholicism is Calvinism, and this, too, on just that doctrine, which was at first common to all the Reformers, but was carried out systematically only in Calvinism. The whole system of the dependence of the individual upon a power, absolutely determining his will and acts, which Catholicism presents in its doctrine of the church, Calvinism attaches to its absolute decree." Pag. 315: "Calvin's contradictory assertions about sin received their most paradoxical expression in his well known formula: *Cadit homo, divina providentia sic ordinante, sed suo vitio cadit.* From whatever side we may consider the matter, this position can only have a rational meaning, when understood as asserting that Adam was not such a man as God would have him be, unless,

* On the question, how far Luther was inclined to adopt such a notion? see *Baur*, in his work against *Möhler*, p. 38. [*Beza's* Brief Declaration of the Table of Predestination, 12mo, translated, London, n. d.]

† *Episcopius* Instit., v. 5, thus defines the difference between the two schemes: Duplex est eorum sententia, qui absolutam hujusmodi prædestinationis gratiam asserunt. Una est eorum, qui statuunt, decretum prædestinationis absolute a Deo ab æterno factum esse, ante omnem hominis aut condendi aut conditi aut lapsi (nedum resipiscentis et credentis) considerationem vel prævisionem. Hi *Supralapsarii* vocantur. Altera est eorum, qui prædestinationis istius objectum statuunt, homines definite præscitos, creatos ac lapsos. *Definite*, inquam, præscitos, etc., ut a prima sententia distinguatur, quæ statuit, objectum prædestinationis homines indefinite præscitos, seu (ut D. Gomarus loquitur) creabiles, labiles, reparabiles, salvabiles, hoc est, qui creari ac prædestinari poterant. Et hi *Sublapsarii* (Infralapsarii) vocantur.... Discrepat posterior sententia a priore in eo tantum, quod prior prædestinationem præordinet lapsui, posterior eam lapsui subordinet. Illa præordinat eam lapsui, ne Deum insipientem faciat: hæc subordinat, ne Deum injustum faciat, *i. e.* lapsus auctorem Comp. *Limborch*, Theol. Christ., iv. 2.

besides the perfection of his nature, there was also something in his nature averse to God, or a fallen nature."]

[9] This was the case, *e. g.*, with the preachers of Delft. Comp. *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. nach der Reformation, v. p. 224. The Synod of Dort also was satisfied with the infralapsarian scheme; at least its decrees made no express mention of Supralapsarianism. And the Form. Cons. Art. 5, only says that Adam's fall was permitted.

[10] Concerning the necessary connection between the universality of grace and conditional election on the one hand, and between particularism (limited redemption) and unconditional election on the other, see *Planck*, l. c. Thus we find in the Formula Concordiæ, p. 618: Christus vero omnes peccatores ad se vocat et promittit illis levationem, et serio vult, ut omnes homines ad se veniant et sibi consuli et subveniri sinant. P. 619: Quod vero scriptum est, multos quidem vocatos, paucos vero electos esse, non ita accipiendum est, quasi Deus nolit, ut omnes salventur, sed damnationis impiorum causa est, quod verbum Dei aut prorsus non audiant, sed contumaciter contemnant, aures obdurent et cor indurent et hoc modo Spiritui Sancto viam ordinariam præcludant, ut opus suum in his efficere nequeat, aut certe quod verbum auditum flocci pendant atque abjiciant. Quod igitur pereunt, neque Deus, neque ipsius electio, sed malitia eorum in culpa est.—The same doctrine was taught by the Remonstrants, Art. 2: Jesum Christum, mundi servatorem, pro omnibus et singulis mortuum esse, atque ita quidem, ut omnibus per mortem Christi reconciliationem et peccatorum remissionem impetraverit, ea tamen conditione, ut nemo illa remissione peccatorum re ipsa fruatur præter hominem fidelem, et hoc quoque secundum evangelium. For other passages see *Winer*, p. 92.

[11] Thus the first Confession of Basle (comp. note 7) does not exclude the possibility that God may have elected all men, or at least all who believe. The authors of the Confess. Helvetica also were cautious in their expressions, c. 10: Deus ab æterno prædestinavit vel elegit libere et mera sua gratia, nullo hominis respectu, sanctos, quos vult salvos facere in Christo.... Et quamvis Deus norit, qui sint sui, et alicubi mentio fiat paucitatis electorum, *bene sperandum est tamen de omnibus, neque temere reprobis quisquam est adnumerandus.* Comp. too, Conf. Angl. Art. 17. Scot. Art. 8. In the Catech. Heidelberg. too, Qu. 20, predestination is made to depend on *faith*. The Calvinists of later times were not agreed among themselves whether Qu. 37 implies the universality of the merits of Christ or not; see *Beckhaus*, l. c. pp. 70, 71. [The 37th Question of the Heidelberg Catechism is, "What dost thou understand by the words *He suffered?*" *Answer:* "That he all the time that he lived on earth, but especially at the end of his life, sustained in body and soul the wrath of God *against the sins of all mankind;* that so by his passion as the only propitiatory sacrifice, he might redeem our body and soul from everlasting damnation, and obtain for us the favor of God, righteousness and eternal life."] The Confess. Marchica maintains naïvely, Art. 14 (after a previous affirmation), "that God is not a cause of the ruin of man, that he takes no pleasure in the death of the wicked, that he neither introduced sin into the world, nor impels men to sin, not that *he will not have all men saved*, for the very contrary is asserted in Scripture

but that the origin of sin and perdition is to be found in Satan and the wicked, whom God, on account of their unbelief and disobedience, cast into condemnation. *Item, we ought not to despair of the salvation of any one, so long as the proper means for obtaining salvation are used*, for no man knows when God will effectually call his people, nor who may yet believe or not, because God is not bound to any time, and orders all things according to his good pleasure. Therefore his Electoral Grace rejects all and every partly blasphemous, partly dangerous, opinions and discourses, such as that we must ascend into heaven by means of our reason, and there examine a special register, or the secret chancery or council-chamber of God, as to the question who is ordained to eternal life or not, though God has sealed up the book of life, so that no creature can look into it." Nevertheless the same Confession expressly condemns as a Pelagian error the notion that God elected the saints—propter fidem provisam.—The doctrine of particular redemption is set forth not only in the Confess. Gall. Art. 12, Belg. Art. 6 (quoted by Winer, p. 88), but definitely in the decrees of the Synod of Dort (quoted by *Winer*, p. 89), and the Form. Cons. Art. 4: Deus ante jacta mundi fundamenta in Christo fecit propositum seculorum (Eph. iii. 11), in quo ex mero voluntatis suæ beneplacito sine ulla meriti, operum vel fidei prævisione ad laudem gloriosæ gratiæ suæ elegit *certum ac definitum* in eadem corruptionis massa et communi sanguine jacentium adeoque peccato corruptorum *numerum*, in tempore per Christum sponsorem et mediatorem unicum ad salutem perducendum, etc.

[12] [Westminster Confession: Chap. iii.: God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass: yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin; nor is violence offered to the will of the creature; nor is the liberty or contingence of second causes taken away, but rather established. 2. Although God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass, upon all supposed conditions, yet hath he not decreed anything because he foresaw it as future, or that which would come to pass, upon such conditions. See also chap. ix. on Free-Will. *Shorter Catechism*, Qu. 13: Our first parents being left to the freedom of their own will, fell from the estate wherein they were created, by sinning against God.—On Redemption, see chap. vii. 3: Man by his fall having made himself incapable of life by that covenant [viz., of works], the Lord was pleased to make a second, commonly called the covenant of grace; wherein he freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him, that they may be saved, and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto life, his Holy Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe. *Larger Catechism*, Qu. 31: The covenant of grace was made with Christ as the second *Adam*, and in him with all the elect as his seed. The Westminster Confession does not distinguish between the covenant of grace, and the covenant of redemption; nor does it use the word atonement in distinction from redemption. The Anglican divines generally stood aloof from the definiteness of Calvinism; see *Jeremy Taylor's* Deus Justificatus, or a Vindication of the Glory of the Divine Attributes, in the question of Original Sin, against the Presbyterian way of understanding it; Works, ix. pp. 315–421.]

With such views were closely connected the questions about the doctrine of irresistible grace, and whether grace may be lost. According to the Reformed, grace works irresistibly, nor can man lose it when once in his possession. Calvin Instit., iii. 2, 12. Canon. Dord., v. 3. The Lutherans take the opposite view, Confess. Aug., 12 (p. 13, against Anabaptists). Form. Concord., p. 705: [Et quidem imprimis falsa et Epicurea illa opinio graviter redarguenda atque rejicienda est, quod quidam fingunt, fidem et acceptam justitiam atque salutem non posse ullis peccatis aut sceleribus amitti, sed etiamsi homo absque Dei timore et pudore pravis suis concupiscentiis indulgent Spiritus S. repugnet, et atrocia flagitia contra conscientiam suam (et quidem malo proposito) designet, nihilominus tamen fidem, gratiam Dei, justitiam atque salutem retineri posse. *Contra hanc pestilentissimam persuasionem* singulari diligentia hae verissimæ, immotæ, divinæ comminationes, pœnæ, et admonitiones christianis, per fidem justificatis sæpe repetendæ atque inculcandæ sunt.] Comp. also the Arminian and Socinian creeds quoted by *Winer*, p. 112. So, too, the doctrine of the certainty of salvation (certitudo salutis) made a part of the theology of the Reformed Church: see *Calvin*, Institutes, iii., c. 24, § 4. [But equally strong statements on this point were made by Luther, and even by Melancthon; the assurance of faith is taught in the Augsburg Confession, and the Apology, and in the Saxon and Wirtemberg Confessions. Among the Reformed Confessions, it is not found in the two of Basle, the Gallican, the Belgic, the second Helvetic, the Scottish, nor in the canons of Dort. The Confession of the Westminster Assembly expressly denies, that assurance is of the essence of saving faith. *Louis le Blanc*, Prof. at Sedan, in his Theological Theses, 1683, maintains, against *Arnauld*, that the doctrine was not generally held by the Reformed. See the British and Foreign Evangelical Review, Oct., 1856, in reply to *Sir William Hamilton*, who, in his Dissertations, pp. 486–7 (Am. ed.), asserted, that on this point Protestants had wholly abandoned their original ground.] As regards the virtues and salvation of the heathen, the adherents of the Augustinian system adopted the views of its founder. This gave more significance to *Zwingle's* different view, advanced in his Christ. Fidei brevis et clara Expositio, § 10.

§ 250.

CONTROVERSIES RESPECTING PREDESTINATION WITHIN THE DENOMINATIONS THEMSELVES.

As early as the lifetime of Calvin himself, *Sebastian Castellio*, and *Jerome Bolsec*, both of Geneva, raised their voices against the Calvinistic doctrine, but did not produce any impression.[1] The more moderate views of Arminius and his followers, always had secret adherents in the Reformed Church itself. *Moses Amyraldus*, a disciple of Cameron, and professor of theology in the academy of Saumur, openly pronounced in favour of what is called Universalismus hypotheticus,[2] a synthesis of universalism and particularism, and was followed by other French theologians.[3] *Claude Pajon*, his disciple, represented the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit as so intimately united with the efficacy of the word, that he denied an immediate influence of the Spirit upon the heart; but yet he proposed to have no controversy with the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination.[4] *Samuel Huber*, who had seceded from the Reformed to the Lutheran Church, extended the universality of salvation farther than the Lutheran theologians allowed, and was therefore

persecuted by both parties.[5]—In the Roman Catholic Church, the advocates of the strict system of Augustine endeavoured, on different occasions, to re-establish its former authority. The controversies carried on in the University of Louvain,[6] and the attempt of *Lewis Molina* to reconcile the doctrine of predestination with that concerning the freedom of the will,[7] gave rise to the papal *Congregationes de Auxiliis* (gratiæ divinæ), which, however did not lead to any important result;[8] until at last *Jansenism* established a permanent opposition to the Pelagian tendency of the Romish Church. The Jansenists also adopted the views of their master concerning predestination.[9] [In the Church of England, predestination was taught in the Thirty-nine Articles; but was gradually supplanted by the Arminian system, in conjunction with Episcopal and Sacramental tendencies. The Scotch Presbyterians, and the English non-conformists held to the Calvinistic view, substantially as stated in the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly of Divines.][10]

[1] Shortly after *Castellio* had removed from Geneva to Basle (1544), he published an exposition of the ninth chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, in which he violently attacked the Calvinistic doctrine. In an anonymous pamphlet published at Paris under the title: Auszüge aus den lateinischen und französischen Schriften Calvins, the doctrine of election by grace was combated "*with the weapons of the keenest satire and acutest dialectics in a manner worthy of Voltaire.*" *Henry*, Leben Calvins, i. p. 389. After his death were published: *Sebast. Castellionis* Dialogi IV. de predestinatione, de electione, de libero arbitrio, de fide. Aresdorffii [Basil.] 1578. 12mo.* On the controversial writings of *Bolsec*, see Bretschneider, in Reformatoren-Almanach 1821, p. 117. *Henry*, iii. 48; *Schenkel*, ii. 174.

[2] Concerning his history (he died 1664), see *Bayle*, Dictionnaire, sub voce: Amyraut; *Jablonski*, Institutt. Hist. Christ. recent. p. 313. *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. nach der Reformation, viii. p. 660 ss. See also above, § 225 *a*, p. 181. It was especially against the assertions of Amyraut, as well as of *Lewis Cappellus* and *Joshua de la Place*, that the rigid doctrine of the Formula Consensus was directed (comp. § 249, note 11.) The views of Amyraut are developed in his Traité de la Prédestination. Saumur, 1634. 12. comp. *e. g.* p. 89: Si vous considerés le soin que Dieu a eu de procurer le salut au genre humain par l'envoy de son fils au monde, et les choses qu'il y a faites et souffertes à ceste fin, la grace est *universelle* et présentée à tous les hommes. Mais si vous regardés à la *condition* qu'il y a nécessairement apposée, de croire en son fils, vous trouverés qu'encore que ce soin de donner aux hommes un Rédempteur procède d'une merveilleuse charité envers le genre humain, néantmoins ceste charité ne passe pas ceste mesure, de donner le salut aux hommes, pourveu qu'ils ne le refusent pas: s'ils le refusent, il leur en oste l'espérance, et eux par leur in-

* With a Preface by Felix Turpio Urbevetanus (Faustus Socinus): see Athen. Raur. p. 360.

crédulité aggravent leur condamnation. Comp. Specimen Animadversionum in Exercitationes de Gratia Universali, Salmur, 1784, 4.—Concerning the further progress of this controversy see *Walch*, Biblioth. Theol. sel., vol. ii., pp. 1023 ss. On Amyraut in particular, see *Schweizer*, Moses Amyraldus, Versuch einer Synthese des Universalismus und des Particularismus (in Zeller's Jahrb., 1852—chiefly against Ebrard's representations): "*Amyraldism has been designated, hypothetical universalism. But this is liable to be misunderstood, and to favor a mistaken representation of the system, as if it broke through the bounds of Calvinistic particularism, and as Ebrard thinks, retained this characteristic only in seeming; while the fact is, that Amyraut was earnest in its favor, and even made it more sharp, whenever possible.*" Yet still there is in Amyraldism an important mitigation of the dogma in this point of view, that "*he appended an ideal universalism to the particularising world-plan.*"

[3] *Tessard, Daillé, Blondel, Claude, Du Bose, Le Faucheur, Mestrezat, Tronchin.* [On Daillé and Blondel, see above, § 225, *a*, Notes 8 and 9. Comp. *A. Vinet*, Histoire de la Predication parmi les Réformés de France au 17e siècle, Paris, 1860. He reckons Du Bose next to Claude in ability.] In opposition was *Du Moulin* (Molinæus of Sédan), and especially *Friedr. Spanheim* in his Exercitationes de Gratia Universali, Lugd. Batav., 1646, to which Amyraut replied in his Exercitatio de Gratia Universali, Salm., 1647. See *Schweizer*, p. 61. [Comp. § 225, *a*: *Vinet*, ubi supra. Du Moulin published 10 decades of sermons, and 60 controversial treatises: his Anatomie of Arminianism, transl. Lond., 1635.]

[4] The views of Pajon were especially contested from the Reformed side, by *Claude* and *Jurieu*: Traité de la Nature et de la Grace, ou de Concours général de la Providence, et du Concours particulier de Grace efficace, contre les nouvelles hypothèses de Mr. P. [ajon] et de ses disciples, Utrecht, 1687: also by *Leydecker* and *Spanheim*: from the Lutheran side by *Val. Ernest Löscher* (Exercitatio Theol. de Claudii Pajonii ejusque Sectatoribus quos Pajonistas vocant Doctrina et Fatis, Lips. 1692). On the relation between his individual opinion and the general dogmatic system of the Reformed Church, and on its significance in the Reformed Theology, see *Al. Schweizer*, in the treatise referred to, § 225, Note 3 [in Zeller's Theol. Jahrb., 1852, 1853, and in *Herzog's* Realencyclop.]

[5] He was a native of Burgdorf, in the Canton Berne, in Switzerland, but was compelled to leave his country on account of his opinions. After he had joined the Lutheran Church, he became first a pastor in the neighborhood of Tübingen, and afterwards a professor in the University of Wittenburg. His assertion that God from eternity elected *all men* to salvation (without respect to their future faith) gave offense to the Lutherans. He was opposed by *Polycarp Lyser* and *Ægidius Hunnius* (1593), whom he in his turn charged with Calvinism. For the particulars of the controversy, and the explanations of *Huber*, see *Schröckh*, iv. p. 661, and *Andr. Schmidii* Dissert. de Sam. Huberi Vita, Fatis et Doctrina, Helmst., 1708, 4. *Jul. Niggers*, Beiträge zur Lebensgesch Sam. Hubers, in Illgen's Zeitschrift, 1844. *Trechsel*, in the Berner Taschenbuch, 1844. *Schweizer*, Centraldogmen, i. 501 sq.

[6] The old controversy between the Thomists and Scotists (Dominicans

and Franciscans) was revived in the age of the Reformation. While the Council of Trent was still assembled, a controversy broke out between *Michael Bajus* (de Bay, born 1513, died 1589), and his colleagues, who were followers of Scotus. Pope Pius V. issued a bull (A. D. 1567) in which he condemned 76 propositions of Bajus (several of which were literally taken from Augustine's writings); but this was done only in a certain sense. Gregory XIII. confirmed this sentence A. D. 1579. But when the Jesuits, *Leonard Less* and *John Hamel*, propounded the Pelagian System too boldly, the professors in the University of Louvain raised their voices against 34 propositions taken from their lectures, and publicly condemned them. For further details see the works on ecclesiastical history. *Baji* Opp. Col., 1696, 4. [Comp. *Kuhn*, Dogmatik, i. 490 sq. The doctrine of Less was condemned by the faculty of *Douay*, 1588, *Estius* being the leader, while *Mayence*, *Treves* and *Ingolstadt* declared for the Jesuits. The Spanish Dominican, *Bannez*, was the ablest Thomist and Augustinian; against him, *Prudentius de Monte-Mayor* defended the scientia media, 1581. The same view was espoused by *Petrus de Fonseca*, in 1566, and defended by *Suarez* in Coimbra, *Vasques* in Compluta, *Gregory of Valentia* in Ingolstadt.—as well as by Molina, see next note.]

[7] He was also a Jesuit, born 1540, and died 1600 (as a professor of theology in the University of Evora in Portugal). He wrote: Liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis, divina præscientia, prædestinatione et reprobatione concordia. He endeavoured to bring about the said reconciliation by distinguishing between præscientia and prædeterminatio; he called the former scientia media.

[8] They were drawn up A. D. 1597 by order of Pope Clement VIII, and issued 1607 by Pope Paul V. The Pope imposed (1611) silence upon both parties.—Comp. *Aug. Le Blanc* (Serry), Historia Congreg. de Auxiliis Gratiæ, Antw. 1700, fol.

[9] See the general history of doctrines. Pope Urban VIII, condemned the "Augustinus" of Jansen in the bull *In Eminenti*. (Bullar, M. Tom. V.), and Pope Innocent X, condemned (1653) five propositions in particular. For further details see the works on ecclesiastical history. Concerning the principles of the Jansenists, see *Reuchlin*, Port-Royal. (Compare also § 228.)

[10] [See above, § 225, *b*, Notes 2, 6, 8, 15, 16, etc. The 17th of the XXXIX articles is of Predestination and Election: Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honor. Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose by his spirit working in due season; they through God's grace obey the calling; they be justified freely; they be made sons of God by adoption; they be made like the image of his only begotten son Jesus Christ; they walk religiously in good works; and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.—Then follow cautions about the use of the doctrine—"for curious and carnal persons,

lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall," etc. The Nine Lambeth Articles (see § 225 *b*, Note 8) taught reprobation. On the controversy as to the doctrinal position of the church of England, see the works of *Laurence*, *Tomline*, *Goode*, *Scott*, *etc.*, referred to in note 2 of § 225 *b*. Abp. *William King* (of Dublin), Divine Predestination and Foreknowledge, Lond. 1710; *Ed. Copleston*, Bp. of Llandaff, Enquiry into the Doctrines of Necessity and Predestination, Lond., 1821. Westminster Confession of Faith, chapter iii, 3. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. 5. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory; out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace. 6. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, fore-ordained all the means thereunto, etc. 7. The rest are passed by and ordained to dishonor and wrath *for their sin*, to the praise of his glorious justice. 8. The doctrine of this high mystery is to be handled with special prudence and care, etc.]

§ 251.

JUSTIFICATION AND SANCTIFICATION. FAITH AND WORKS.

Möhler, Symbolik, p. 134 ss. *Baur*, *p.* 215 ss.

Roman Catholics and Protestants agreed in ascribing to God the justification of the sinner, but differed in this, that the former confounded the act of justification with that of sanctification, so as to represent both as the one act of *making just*,[1] while the Protestants separated the one from the other, asserting that the justification of the sinner before God (which is described as a forensic act on the part of God), is antecedent to his sanctification, which is physical (that is affecting the nature) and therapeutical).[2] Both Roman Catholics and Protestants ascribed to faith a justifying power, in the case of the sinner: but there was this great difference between them, that the former maintained that, *in addition to* faith, good works are a necessary condition of salvation, and ascribed to them a certain degree of meritoriousness,[3] while the latter adhered rigidly to the proposition "*sola fides justificat.*"[4] Some opposing sects,[5] however, which had their origin in Protestantism, formed here again an exception. While Arminians and Socinians agreed with other Protestants in restricting justification in the first instance, to the act of

granting pardon,[6] the Mennonites and Quakers regarded it as a therapeutical act.[7] Respecting the relation between faith and works, the Arminians and Socinians, as well as the Mennonites, adopted views more closely allied to those of the Roman Catholics, but with this important difference,[8] that they denied the meritoriousness of works,[9] though holding them to be necessary. [Many theologians of the Anglican Church occupied an intermediate position.[10]]

[5] Conc. Trid., Sess. VI, cap. 7: Justificatio non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiæ et donorum, unde homo ex injusto fit justus et ex inimico amicus, ut sit hæres secundum spem vitæ æternæ, etc. Comp. Can. 11, and *Bellarmine*, De Justif., ii. 2:....Sicut aër, cum illustratur a sole per idem lumen, quod recipit, desinit esse tenebrosus et incipit esse lucidus, sic etiam homo per eandem justitiam sibi a sole justitiæ donatam atque infusam desinit esse injustus, delente videlicet lumine gratiæ tenebras peccatorum, etc.

[6] Apol. Augustanæ Conf. p. 125: Justificare hoc loco (Rom. v. 1), forensi consuetudine significat reum absolvere et pronuntiare justum, sed propter alienam justitiam, videlicet Christi, quæ aliena justitia communicatur nobis per fidem. Comp. p. 73; p. 109. Form. Conc., p. 785. Helv. II, c. 15: Justificare significat Apostolo in disputatione de justificatione: peccata remittere, a culpa et pœna absolvere, in gratiam recipere et justum pronuntiare.—"*According to the Roman Catholic doctrine, Christ, by the act of justification, is really 'embodied in the believer, so that the latter becomes a living reflection of the prototype; according to the Protestant doctrine, he casts only his shadow upon the believer, which so shelters him, that God does not see his sinfulness.*" *Möhler*, Symbolik, p. 134. On the other side see *Baur* p. 229 ss. and the passage quoted by Möhler p. 136, from *Calvin's* Antidot. in Conc. Trid., p. 702: Neque tamen negandum est, quin perpetuo *conjunctæ sint ac cohæreant* duæ ista res, sanctificatio et justificatio. Protestants do not deny that justification and sanctification are closely connected, but they do deny that they are one and the same thing; when the Formula Conc. (Solida Declar. iii. p. 695) says: Totam justitiam nostram *extra nos* quærendam, it explains this immediately after by adding: extra omnium hominum merita, opera, etc. [In the doctrine of justification by faith, the whole antagonism between Romanism and Protestantism is most clearly seen. Protestants make the subjective and individual reception of salvation to be, on the one hand, the inmost experience of the individual, while, on the other hand, it represents it as mediated as slightly as possible by the agency of the person himself. Catholicism not only lets the individual participate in it, but also introduces a whole series of intermediate acts between God and man, in which is brought out the externalizing tendency of its whole system. *Baur*, p. 331.]

[7] Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. c. 6–c. 8: Per fidem ideo justificari dicimur, quia fides est humanæ salutis *initium, fundamentum et radix* omnis justificationis. —On the other hand, c. 9: Si quis dixerit, *sola* fide impium justificari, ita ut intelligat nihil aliud requiri, quod ad justificationis gratiam consequendam

cooperetur.....anathema sit. Comp. c. 12. This is allied with the moral and external (historical) idea of faith. Cat. Rom. I. i., 1: Nos de ea fide loquimur, cujus vi omnino assentimur iis, quæ tradita sunt divinitus. Faith taken in this sense (as submission to the authority of the church) may be said to be meritorious. The meritoriousness of works consists in this, that the justitia is *increased* by the performance of good works. Comp. Concil. Trident. Sess. vi. (quoted by *Winer*, p. 104); Catech. Rom. ii. 5, 71. *Bellarmine*, Justific. v. 1, iv. 7. Nevertheless (according to Bellarmine), the merits of men will not throw the merits of Christ into the shade; they are rather themselves the effect of the merits of Christ, and serve to manifest his glory among men. *Bellarmine*, v. 5 (quoted by *Winer*, p. 105.)

[4] Confessio Augustana, Art. 4: Docent, quod homines non possunt justificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis aut operibus, sed gratis justificentur propter Christum per fidem, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi, et peccata remitti propter Christum, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit. Hanc fidem imputat Deus pro justitia coram ipso.—But Protestants did not understand by faith mere *historical* faith (as did Roman Catholics),* see Art. 20 (p. 18): Admonentur etiam homines, quod hic nomen fidei non significet tantum historiæ notitiam, qualis est in impiis et diabolo, sed significet fidem, quæ credit non tantum historiam, sed etiam *effectum historiæ*, videlicet hunc articulum, remissionem peccatorum, quod videlicet per Christum habeamus gratiam, justitiam et remissionem peccatorum. Comp. Apologia, p. 68.—Concerning good works, and the relation in which they stand to faith, *Luther*, at first set a high value upon the *genuine* works of mercy, distinguishing these from the dead works of the law and of ceremonies; but he also denied the meritoriousness of the best works, and regarded them with suspicion, whenever they did not proceed from faith; comp. *Schenkel*, ii. 193, *sq.*—The Confess. August. says, Art. 20, p. 16: Falso accusantur nostri, quod bona opera prohibeant....Docent nostri, quod necesse sit bona opera facere, non ut confidamus per ea gratiam mereri, sed propter voluntatem Dei. —Apol. p. 81: Nos quoque dicimus, quod delectio fidem sequi debeat. Neque tamen ideo sentiendum est, quod fiducia hujus dilectionis aut propter hanc dilectionem accipiamus remissionem peccatorum et reconciliationem.

* The contending parties were well acquainted with the different meanings attached to the term "faith." See *Bellarmine*, De Justific. § 4. They were not engaged in any mere logomachy. Only this is to be lamented, that the Protestants (even Luther) did not hold fast to the internal and dynamic idea of faith, but frequently confounded it (like the Catholics) with the fides historica. This gave rise to a faith-righteousness, worse even than righteousness by works, since it cost no effort, and gave occasion to pride and harshness towards those who held different views; see *Schenkel*, ii. 200 sq. *Zwingle*, on the other hand, urged the *moral* nature of faith; ibid., 299. *Melancthon* and *Calvin* tried to harmonize the dogmatical and ethical elements of the idea; ibid., 322 sq. [The difference between the Reformed and Lutheran system is strikingly seen in their doctrine respecting faith. In the Calvinistic scheme, faith is one of the elements in the series of absolute predestination; the Lutheran system tries on this point to set aside the absolute decree, but in a fluctuating way, making faith on the one hand to be a gift of God, and yet on the other hand, not daring to take the Pelagian ground, that a *prævisa fides* conditioned the election. *Baur*, p. 334.]

Ibid. p. 85: Falso calumniantur nos adversarii, quod nostri non doceant bona opera, cum ea non solum requirant, sed etiam ostendant, quomodo fieri possint, etc. Comp. *Winer*, p. 99 and 105, where other passages are quoted from the Lutheran symbols.—The creeds of the Reformed Church express themselves in similar terms. Thus the Confession of Basle, Art. 9, *Concerning Faith and Good Works:* We acknowledge the forgiveness of sins by faith in Jesus Christ, the crucified one; though this faith continually exercises, and manifests itself, and is preserved, by works of love, we do not ascribe righteousness and satisfaction for our sins to works as the fruit of faith, but solely to true confidence and faith in the blood of the Lamb of God, which was shed for the remission of our sins; for we freely confess that all things are given to us in Christ. Therefore believers are not to perform good works to make satisfaction for their sins, but only in order to manifest their gratitude for the great mercy which the Lord God has shown to us in Christ.—Compare also the arrangement of the Catechism of Heidelberg, where the whole system of ethics is included in the article concerning Gratitude. Conf. Helv. II. c. 15: Docemus cum Apostola, hominem peccatorem justificari sola fide in Christum, etc. The following definition is given in ch. 16: Fides humana non est opinio ac humana persuasio, sed firmissima fiducia et evidens ac constans animi assensus, denique certissima comprehensio veritatis Dei....atque adeo Dei ipsius, summi boni, et præcipue promissionis divinæ et Christi, qui omnium promissionum est colophon.—Heidelberg Catech., Qu. 21: What is true faith? Answ. It is not only a certain knowledge whereby I hold for truth all that God has revealed to us in his Word, but also an assured confidence, which the Holy Ghost works by the Gospel in my heart, that not only to others, but to me also, remission of sins, everlasting righteousness and salvation are freely given by God, merely of grace, only for the sake of Christ's merits.

[6] For example, *Thomas Münzer*, *David Joris*, *Seb. Frank*, *Thamer*, *Schwenkfeld*, etc. See *Schenkel*, ii. 251. *Hagen.*, ii. 374.

[6] Confess. Remonstrant. 18, 3, and Apolog. Conf. Rem. p. 112, a. (quoted by Winer, p. 97): Justificatio est actio Dei, quam Deus pure pute in sua ipsius mente efficit, quia nihil aliud est, quam volitio aut decretum, quo peccata remittere et justitiam imputare aliquando vult iis, qui credunt, *i. e.*, quo vult pœnas peccatis eorum promeritas iis non infligere eosque tamquam justos tractare et præmio afficere.—The *Socinians* also regarded justification as a forensic act. Catech. Racov. Qu. 433 (ibid.): Justificatio est, cum nos Deus pro justis habet, quod ea ratione facit, cum nobis et peccata remittit et nos vita æterna donat. Comp. *Socinus*, de Justif. (Opp. ii. p. 603): *Duplici* autem ratione amovetur peccatum: vel quia non imputatur ac perinde habetur ac si nunquam fuisset, vel quia peccatum ipsum revera aufertur, nec amplius peccatur....What he says further on: *Utraque* hæc amovendi peccati ratio in justificatione coram Deo nostra conspicitur, might lead us to think that he identified sanctification and justification, but in the sequel he distinctly separates them: Ut autem cavendum est, ne, ut hodie plerique faciunt, vitæ sanctitatem atque innocentiam effectum justificationis nostræ coram Deo esse dicamus, sic diligenter cavere debemus, ne ipsam sanctitatem atque innocentiam justificationem nostram coram Deo esse credamus, neve illam nostræ

coram Deo justificationis causam efficientem aut impulsivam esse affirmemus, sed tantummodo causam, sine qua eam justificationem non contingere decrevit, Deus. The difference between justificatio and obedientia is so defined, that by the former we are to understand the remissio peccatorum, and by obedientia a mere condition, under which justification occurs.

[7] *Ries*, Conf. Art. 21: Per vivam fidem acquirimus veram justitiam, *i. e.*, condonationem seu remissionem omnium tam præteritorum quam præsentium peccatorum, ut et veram justitiam, quæ per Jesum cooperante Spir. Sancto abundanter in nos effunditur vel infunditur, adeo ut ex malis....fiamus boni atque ita ex injustis revera justi.—*Barclay*, Apol. 7, 3, p. 128, does not comprise under justification good works as such, not even when viewed as the effects of the Holy Spirit in us, but the *formatio Christi in nobis*, the new birth, which at the same time comprehends sanctification; for it is *realis interna animæ renovatio*; for those, qui Christum in ipsis formatum habent, integrum eum et indivisum possident.

[7] Limborch Theol. Christ. vi. 4, 22:....Sine operibus fides mortua et ad justificationem inefficax est. 4, 31. Comp. Conf. Remonstr. xi. 1 ss., and Apol. Confess. p. 113 (quoted by *Winer*, p. 102). According to *Socinus* (De Justif. in the Biblioth. Fratr. Pol. Tom. ii. p. 601. ss.) there is faith in obedience to the divine commandments. "*When they advance anything else concerning justifying faith....they borrow it from Roman Catholic theologians.*" [?] *Möhler*, p. 634. For the views of the Mennonites concerning justification, see *Ries*, Confess. Art. 29: Fides....debet comitata esse amore Dei et firma confidentia in unum Deum.

[8] *Schyn*, Plen. Deduct. p. 232 (quoted by *Winer*, p. 107): Non credimus bona opera nos salvare, sed agnoscimus bona opera pro debita obedientia et fructibus fidei. *Socinus* also asserted, that good works, though necessary, are not meritorious (non sunt meritoria): de Justif. p. 603.

[9] [The article on Justification in the Book of Homilies, 1547, was drawn up by *Cranmer*. Bp. *George Bull*, Harmonia Apostolica, two dissertations on the doctrine of James on Justification, and his agreement with Paul (Works, vol. iii.). *John Davenant*, Bp. of Salisbury, Treatise on Justification, 1631, new ed., 1844, defends the Reformed doctrine. Bp. *William Forbes* (of Edinburgh, b. 1585, d. 1634), Considerationes Modestæ (against Bellarmine on Justification), Lond., 1658 (posthumous), reprinted, Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol. i. 1850. The Article XI. (of the XXXIX. Articles) reads: We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings, wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification. Art. XII. represents good works only as the "fruits of faith." The views of the Platonizing English divines are set forth most clearly in John Smith's (of Cambridge) Select Discourses; Of Legal and Evangelical Righteousness, the 7th Discourse.]

§ 252.

FLUCTUATIONS WITHIN THE DENOMINATIONS THEMSELVES.

Differences of opinion, however, obtained among Protestant theologians themselves. Thus, *Andrew Osiander* represented justification and sanctification as forming only *one act*;[1] and as regards the relation in which good works stand to faith, the views of *Nicolas Amsdorf* were diametrically opposed to those of *George Major*. The latter asserted that good works contributed to salvation, while the former maintained, that they are productive rather of evil than of good.[2] *Calixtus*, somewhat later, emphasized the ethical element, and although he retained the formula, *sola* fides, he opposed the fides *solitaria*.[3] Both the Lutheran and Calvinistic mystics attached (like the Quakers) great importance to sanctification, and were strongly opposed to that theology which represents justification as an external, legal transaction.[4]

[1] On *Osiander's* doctrine in its earliest form (after 1524) see *Heberle* in the Studien u. Kritiken, 1844. It is further developed in the two disputations which he held, A. D. 1549 and 1550, in his treatise: De unico Mediatore, 1551, and in various sermons. He maintained, that what was called justification by orthodox theologians, should be more properly designated *redemption*. (Illustrated by the case of a Moor, ransomed from slavery.) In his opinion, the signification of δικαιοῦν is to "make just;" it is only by metonymy that it can mean "to pronounce a person just." Comp. *Planck*, iv. p. 249, ss. *Tholuck's* Anzeiger, 1833, No. 54, 55. *Schenkel*, ii. 355. He was opposed by *Francis Staphylus*, *Mörlin*, and others. [*Baur* in Dogmengesch. 332: Justification according to Osiander, is the mystical union of man with Christ, as the absolute principle of righteousness.... The believer is so embodied in Christ, that in this living concrete unity, he is flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone.... The Formula Concordia is incorrect in representing his doctrine, as excluding the human nature of Christ from the work of redemption.]

[2] Compare Amsdorf's treatise: Dass die Propositio, gude Werke sind schädlich zur Seligkeit, eine rechte sei, reprinted in *S. Baumgarten*, Geschichte der Religionsparteien, p. 1172–78. Amsdorf speaks, in the first instance, of those works by which men hope to deserve salvation; but even those works which are the fruit of faith are imperfect, on account of sin, and would condemn us before the judgment-seat of Christ, if God did not condescend to accept them for the sake of faith in Christ. In his opinion there was no medium between that which is *necessary* to salvation, and that which *does harm*. "Though the dialectical proof of this inference, or consequence, come short of being complete, which, however, it does not, it can satisfactorily be established on theological grounds." But it is especially "on account of monks and hypocrites that it is necessary to adhere to this proposition, though it may give offence to reason and in philosophy." Ams-

dorf admits that works may be the "*manifestations and evidences of faith*," "for as long as faith exists, good works also follow, and when we commit sin, we do not *lose* salvation, because *we have previously lost it by unbelief*." Comp. *Planck*, iv. p. 69, ss. *Calvin* is also decidedly opposed to Osiandrism, which he calls a *calumnia*. Comp. Institutes III. c. 11, § 10, *sq.*, and c. 13, § 5: Quicunque garriunt, nos fide justificari, quia regeniti spiritualiter vivendo justi sumus, nunquam gustarunt gratiæ dulcedinem, ut Deum sibi propitium fore confiderent. [See above, p. 149. *Ritschl*, Die Rechtfertigungslehre Osianders, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologia, 1857. *Frank*, De Satisf. Christi ex Lite Osiandr. Erlang., 1858. *Gran*, De Andr Osiand. Doctrina, 1860. *Baur*, Lehre d. Versöhnung, 1838, p. 326, *sq.*]

[3] See Disputatio Theologica de gratuita Justificatione, præside J. Calixto exponit *G. Titius*, Helmst., 1650. Against this the Consensus Repetitus, Punct., 42–57 (in *Henke's* ed., p. 32, *sq.*). *Gass*, i. 74. [*Gieseler*, Church Hist., New York ed., iv. § 52.]

[4] *Schwenkfeld* had already maintained that the tendency of Luther's doctrine was to seduce common people into errors and carnal liberty. He admitted that the doctrine (concerning faith and good works) was true in a certain sense, and under certain limitations, but he thought that it might easily be perverted so as to lead to belief in the mere letter of Scripture, and to moral indifference. Comp. *Planck*, v. 1, p. 83, ss. *Schenkel*, u. s. § 251, note. Faith, according to Schwenkfeld, is essentially dynamic, "a gracious gift of the divine essence, a drop from the heavenly fountain, a glittering of the eternal sun, a spark of the eternal fire, which is God, and in short, a *communion* and *participation* of the divine nature and essence (ὑπόστασις, Hebr. xi. 1); see his work, Vom Worte Gottes, 110, b. and *Erbkam*, Prot. Secten, 431, *sq.*—[The fundamental significance, which Osiander ascribed to the essential righteousness of Christ, in the matter of justification, is attributed by Schwenkfeld to the glorified flesh of Christ. *Baur*, p. 333.] *J. Böhme* (von der Menschwerdung Christi, vol. ii. c. 7, § 15, quoted by *Umbreit*, p. 51) says: "The hypocritical Babylon now teaches: Our works deserve nothing, Christ has redeemed us from death and hell, we must only *believe* it, in order to be saved. Dost thou not know, Babylon, that the servant who, knowing his master's will, does not fulfill it, will be beaten with many stripes? Knowledge without action is like a fire, which glimmers, but cannot burn, because the fuel is moist. If thou wilt have thy fire of faith burn, thou must blow upon it, and free it from the moisture of the devil and of hell; thou must enter into the life of Christ, and do his commandments," etc.—Though *Arnd* adhered more firmly than Böhme to the fundamental principles of Lutheranism, he always urged the necessity of that *love* which proceeds from faith (see the passages quoted from his Wahres Christenthum, in *Hagenbach's* Vorlesungen, vol. iii. p. 377–79.) *Poiret* called that faith which manifests itself especially as an uncharitable spirit of opposition, *military* faith. (Ibid. iv. p. 327.)

§ 253.

THE ECONOMY OF REDEMPTION.

[*Schröder*, Die Ordo Salutis, in Studien und Kritiken, 1857.]

The fundamental principles laid down in the symbolical books, were more fully developed by theologians, especially by those of the Protestant Church, so as to form a definite *economy of redemption*. After God has called the sinner (vocatio), and man heard that call (auditio), operations of the Divine Spirit (operationes Spiritus), follow each other in definite succession—viz. 1. Illuminatio ; 2. Conversio (pœnitentia) ; 3. Sanctificatio (renovatio) ; 4. Perseverantia; 5. Unio mystica cum Deo. Theologians, however, did not quite agree as to the precise order of these operations.[1] The mystics, and the so-called pietists, neglected all those scholastic definitions, and had a system and terminology of their own.[2]

[1] Compare the works of the orthodox Protestant theologians, cited in *De Wette*, Dogmatik, p. 151, ss. *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 287, ss., where passages are also quoted from the writings of other divines; *Gass*, i. 362, *sq.*, and the works of *Hülsemann*, and *Musäus*, to which he refers.

[2] The theory of the economy of salvation was established on account of, and in opposition to, the pietists. See *De Wette*, p. 151. For their views concerning the so-called Theologia Irregenitorum, and the economy of salvation, see *Planck*, Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie, p. 223 ss. The pietists asserted that the regeneration of man commences with a change in his will; their opponents maintained that the illumination of the understanding was the first step. The conscious experience of the unio mystica raised some mystics to the height of ecstasy; with others it subsided into quietism. See *Molina's* Guida Spirituale (extracts in *Scharling*, ubi supra, p. 55 sq), and the appendix, p. 236. [This Spiritual Guide was published in Spain, 1675 ; an English translation appeared, 1688.] As no reference was made to the unio mystica in the symbolical books, theologians entertained different views.—On the controversy between the theologians of Leipsic and Wittenberg on the one hand, and those of Tübingen and Helmstädt on the other (which had its origin in the assertion of *Justus Feuerborn*, that there is an approximatio of the divine substance to the human), comp. *Walch*, Religionsstreitigkeiten der evangelisch—luther. Kirche, iii. p. 130 ss. [In the Augsburg Confession, justification is made the fruit of conversion, and precedes sanctification. *Calvin*, Inst. III, cap. 5, puts faith first, and then Pœnitentia, with its two divisions of mortificatio and vivificatio. *Gerhard's* order is, Pœnitentia, Justificatio, Bona Opera. *Hollaz* is most minute : Vocatio, Illuminatio, Conversio, Regeneratio, Justificatio, Unio mystica, Renovatio, Conservatio, Gratia glorificans, etc. Comp. *Schröder*, ubi supra. On the different positions assigned in the Lutheran and Reformed systems to decrees, imputation, satisfaction, faith, etc., see *Schneckenburger*, in Theol. Jahrb., 1844.]

THIRD DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINES CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND ITS MEANS OF GRACE, CONCERNING SAINTS, IMAGES, THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, AND PURGATORY.

(THE PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES.)

§ 254.

INTRODUCTION.

With the differences about the formal,[1] as well as the material principle,[2] which constitute Roman Catholicism on the one hand, and Protestantism on the other, are intimately connected their respective views concerning the church and its means of grace, concerning the forms of worship, especially the mass and the sacrifice of the mass, and concerning the connection subsisting between the latter, and the state of the dead (purgatory); or, more properly speaking, these views are the necessary consequences of their principles. But Protestants and Roman Catholics, as distinguished from the sects, were agreed in preserving the historical and positive basis of Christianity, though they differed as to extent and manner, and in retaining external and legal forms. On the other hand, the sects, rejecting more or less arbitrarily the historical development of Christianity and its higher influence in shaping the life of society, exposed themselves to the disintegrating power of separatism, now on the side of barren reflection, and again in the way of fantastical mysticism.[3]

[1] Wherever the so-called *abuses* of the Roman Catholic Church are mentioned in the symbolical writings of the Protestants, they are rejected chiefly because they are either not founded upon *Scripture*, or are directly opposed to it.

[2] The fundamental contrast between *faith* and *works* (the internal and the external), manifests itself also in the doctrines in question. Where Protestants suppose an invisible order of things, Roman Catholics rely upon the external form, which strikes the senses; where the former seek means of grace, the latter find opera operato, etc.

[3] Dissolution into fragments of churches, and disintegration into atoms,

are the common fate of all sects. Another thing common to them al. is the disregard they manifest to whatever is *symbolical* in public worship. They either despise it altogether as only captivating the senses, or they regard it it as a vain ceremony.—While Protestantism was in some respects liable to foster such a development, it also included powerful principles of an opposite tendency, which gave rise to the organization of forms of worship and of ecclesiastical polity. The Calvinists rather endeavoured to build anew from the foundation, while the Lutherans were more attached to historical precedents.

§ 255.

THE CHURCH AND ECCLESIASTICAL POWER.

Köstlin, Luther's Lehre von der Kirche, Stuttg., 1853. *Hansen*, Die lutherische und die reformirte Kirchenlehre von der Kirche, Gotha, 1854. *Münchmeier* [die sichtbare und unsichtbare Kirche, Götting., 1854; comp. *Ritschl* in Studien und Kritiken, 1859. *Köstlin*, Wesen der Kirche, Deutsche Zeitschrift, 1855; Die Katholische Auffassung, ibid. On *Melancthon's* views see, Reuter's Repertorium, Sept. 1856. *William Palmer*, A Treatise on the Church of Christ, 3d ed., 2 vols., 1842, repr. New York. Abp. *Whately*, The Kingdom of Christ, 1841, repr. New York. *Edward Arthur Litten*, The Church of Christ in its Idea, etc., repr. New York, 1856. *Charles Hodge*, The Church, etc., in Princeton Review, 1853, 4, 6, reprinted in his Essays and Reviews, 1857.]

The old antagonism between the external and internal idea of the church was more fully developed by the conflicts between Romanism and Protestantism. According to Roman Catholics, the church is a visible society of all baptised persons, who adopt a certain external creed, have the same sacraments, and acknowledge the Pope as their common head.[1] Protestants assert that the church consists in the invisible fellowship of all those who are united by the bonds of true faith, which ideal union is but imperfectly represented by the visible church, in which the true gospel is taught, and the sacraments are rightly administered.[2] In the view of the former, individuals come to Christ through the church; in the view of the latter, they come to the church through Christ.[3] With this difference in fundamental principles is connected the different view entertained by Protestants and Roman Catholics concerning ecclesiastical power and the hierarchy. Protestants not only reject the papacy, and all the gradation of ecclesiastical dignities in the Roman Catholic sense, but, proceeding from the idea of the spiritual priesthood of all Christians, regard the clergy not, like their opponents, as an order of men specially distinct from the laity, but as the body of the teachers and servants of the church, who being divinely called and properly appointed, possess certain ecclesiastical rights, and have to perform certain duties which they derive partly from divine, partly

from human law.[4] In their opposition to the hierarchy, the Anabaptists and Quakers went still further, rejecting not only the order of priests, but also that of *instructors*, and made the right of teaching in the church to depend on an *internal* call alone.[5] [The Church of England occupied an intermediate position between the Roman Catholics and the other reformed churches, retaining the Episcopate and the theory of apostolical succession,[6] though not at first denying the validity of the orders of other churches,[7] and vigorously opposing the pretensions of the papacy.[8] The Presbyterian polity was shaped most completely in Scotland.[9] Independency (Congregationalism) was planted in New England, and had a temporary triumph in England under Cromwell.[10]]

[1] After the example of Augustine (in his controversy with the Donatists), the Roman Catholics maintained that the church militant on earth* is composed of the good and the wicked. See Confess. August. Confut., c. 7, and Cat. Rom., i. 10, 7. It is in *Bellarmine's* treatise, De Ecclesia Milit., in particular that this doctrine is very clearly developed, c. 2: Nostra sententia est, ecclesiam, *unam* tantum esse, non duas, et illam unam et veram esse cœtum hominum ejusdem christianæ fidei professione et eorundam sacramentorum communione colligatum, sub regimine legitimorum pastorum ac præcipue unius Christi in terris vicarii, romani pontificis. Ex qua definitione facile colligi potest, qui homines ad ecclesiam pertineant, qui vero ad eam non pertineant. Tres enim sunt partes hujus definitionis: Professio veræ fidei, sacramentorum communio, et subjectio ad legitimum pastorem, romanum pontificem. Ratione primæ partis excluduntur omnes infideles, tam qui nunquam fuerunt in ecclesia, ut Judæi, Turcæ, Pagani, tam qui fuerunt et recesserunt, et hæretici et apostatæ. Ratione secundæ excluduntur catechumeni et excommunicati, quoniam illi non sunt admissi ad sacramentorum communionem, isti sunt dimissi. Ratione tertiæ excluduntur schismatici, qui habent fidem et sacramenta, sed non subduntur legitimo pastori, et ideo foris profitentur fidem et sacramenta percipiunt. Includuntur autem omnes alii, etiamsi reprobi, scelesti et impii sunt. Atque hoc interest inter sententiam nostram et alias omnes, quod omnes aliæ requirunt internas virtutes ad constituendum aliquem in ecclesia et propterea ecclesiam veram invisibilem faciunt; nos autem et credimus in ecclesia inveniri omnes virtutes, fidem, spem, caritatem et ceteras; tamen ut aliquis aliquo modo dici possit pars veræ ecclesiæ, de qua scripturæ loquuntur, non putamus requiri ullam internam virtutem, sed tantum externam professionem fidei et sacramentorum communionem, quæ sensu ipso percipitur. Ecclesia enim est cœtus hominum ita

* The distinction which Roman Catholics make between ecclesia *militans* and *triumphans*, has reference to this world, and to that which is to come, while the distinction made by Protestants between the *visible* and *invisible* church, has reference to this world only. Comp. *Schweizer*, ii. 663, [in his Glaubenslehre der reform Kirche: Ecclesia est partim militans partim triumphans in cœlis; illa quæ adhuc in terris colligitur, est visibilis, vel invisibilis: *Aretius.*]

visibilis et palpabilis, ut est cœtus populi romani vel regnum Galliæ aut respublica Venetorum.

[2] On the gradual development of the idea of the church in Luther's system, see *Schenkel*, Wesen der Protest., iii. 1 sq., and *Köstlin*, ubi supra; on *Zwingle's* views, see *Schenkel*, p. 61 sq. On *Calvin*, ibid., p. 99 sq. (comparing the fourth Book of his Institutes). Conf. Aug., Art. 7: Est ecclesia congregatio sanctorum, in qua evangelium recte docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta. Apol. Confess. Aug., p. 144 ss.: Et catholicam ecclesiam dicit [articulus ille in Symbolo], ne intelligamus, ecclesiam esse politiam externam certarum gentium, sed magis homines sparsos per totum orbem, qui de evangelio consentiunt, et habent eundem Christum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, et eadem sacramenta, sive habeant easdem traditiones humanas, sive dissimiles.—p. 148: Neque vero somniamus nos Platonicam civitatem, ut quidem impie cavillantur, sed dicimus existere hanc ecclesiam, videlicet vere credentes ac justos sparsos per totum orbem. First Confess. of Basle, Art. 5: "We acknowledge a holy Christian Church, *i. e.* the communion of saints, the spiritual assembly of believers, which is holy, and an offspring of Christ, of which all those are citizens who truly confess that Jesus is the Christ, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world, and who give evidence of their faith by works of love." Conf. Helv. II, c. 17: Oportet semper fuisse, esse et futuram esse ecclesiam, *i. e.* e mundo evocatum vel collectum cœtum fidelium, sanctorum inquam omnium communionem, eorum videlicet, qui Deum verum in Christo servatore per Verbum et Spiritum Sanctum vere cognoscunt et rite colunt, denique omnibus bonis per Christum gratuito oblatis fide participant....Illam docemus veram esse ecclesiam, in qua signa vel notæ inveniuntur ecclesiæ veræ, imprimis vero verbi divini legitima vel sincera prædicatio. Conf. Gall., Art. 27. Belg. 27: Credimus unicam ecclesiam catholicam seu universalem, quæ est congregatio sancta seu cœtus omnium vere fidelium christianorum, qui totam suam salutem in uno Jesu Christo exspectant, sanguine ipsius abluti et per spiritum ejus sanctificati atque obsignati. *Sancta hæc ecclesia certo in loco non est sita vel limitata, aut ad certas singularesque personas alligata, sed per totum mundum sparsa atque diffusa.*—Comp. Angl., 19, Scot. 16. [Westminster Confession, chap. xxv: The Catholic or universal church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof; is the spouse, the body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all. The visible church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel (not confined to one nation as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.] The doctrine concerning the Church is most ably and acutely developed by *Calvin* Instit., iv. 1 ss. Comp. *Henry*, vol. ii. p. 90 ss. The *Arminians* (*Limborch* Theol., vii. 1, 6) and the Mennonites adopted substantially the same principles as the Calvinists. *Ries*, Conf. Art. 24. Concerning the views of the Quakers and Socinians, see *Winer*, p. 168.—The latter, in particular, attached little importance to the doctrine concerning the church. See *Socinus*, Opp. T. i. 3: Quod si dicas, ad salutem

necessarium esse, ut quis sit in vera Christi ecclesia, et propterea necessarium simul esse, ut veram Christi ecclesiam inquirat et agnoscat, negabo consecutionem istam.... Nam simulatque quis Christi salutarem *doctrinam* habet, is jam vel re ipsa in vera Christi ecclesia est, vel ut sit non habet necesse inquirere, quænam sit vera Christi ecclesia, id enim....jam novit. From this he infers: Quæstionem de ecclesia, quænam, sive apud quos sit, quæ hodie tantopere agitatur, vel inutilem propemodum esse, vel certe non esse necessariam.—The principle *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* was also retained by the Protestant Church, though in a somewhat different sense. Comp. *Winer*, p. 169. It also concedes that the *true* church can not err (as to the faith); it is a columna veritatis; see Augsb. Confes. p. 148. The later Lutheran divines lay claim to this predicate exclusively for their (the Lutheran) church, excluding not only the Roman Catholics, but also Calvinists, from the church; see Consensus Repetitus Fidei, punct. 59 (in *Henke*, p. 44): Rejicimus eos, qui docent ad ecclesiam christianam pertinere non tantum Lutheranos et Græcos [sic], sed Pontificios etiam et Calvinianos.

[3] Thus *Calvin*, l. c. laid some stress on the phraseology of the Apostles' Creed, where it is not said, Credo in ecclesiam, like, credo in Deum, in Christum; but simply, Credo ecclesiam. "*Protestantism demands obedience under Christ, and connects therewith the participation of the individual in the church; Roman Catholicism on the other hand demands obedience under the hierarchy, and makes dependent thereon the participation of the individual in the blessings received from Christ; Schenkel*, iii. 26.

[4] On the connection between the Roman Catholic notion of the priestly office and the sacrifice of the mass, see Concil. Trident. Sess. 23, c. 1. On the other side, Apol. Confess. Aug., p. 201: Sacerdotum intelligunt adversarii non de ministerio verbi et sacramentorum aliis porrigendorum, sed intelligunt de sacrificio, quasi oporteat esse in Novo Testamento sacerdotium simile Levitico, quod pro populo sacrificet et mereatur aliis remissionem peccatorum. Nos docemus, etc.....Ideo sacerdotes vocantur, non ad ulla sacrificia velut in lege pro populo facienda ut per ea mereantur populo remissionem peccatorum, sed vocantur ad docendum evangelium et sacramenta porrigenda populo. *Luther* expressed himself on this subject as follows: "Every Christian man is a priest, and every Christian woman a priestess, whether they be young or old, master or servant, mistress or maid-servant, scholar or illiterate." Opp. Altenb., ed. i., fol. 522, (in *Spener*, geistliches Priesterthum, Frankf. 1677, p. 76 sq.): "All Christians are, properly speaking, members of the clerical order, and there is no difference between them, except that they hold different offices. (1 Cor. xii.) By baptism we are all made priests, (1 Pet. ii.) We do not want to be *made*, but *born*, popes, and to have our papacy by inheritance, through our birth from our fathers and mothers; for our father is the true pope and high priest (Ps. cx.) Hence we take persons from such born popes, and call them to such offices. Papal or Episcopal ordination can only make hypocrites and oil-idolaters" [Germ. Oelgötzen.]....Not only those "who are anointed and have received the tonsure" are priests, "but every one who is baptised may consider himself an ordained priest, bishop, and pope, *though it does not belong to every one* to exercise the duties belonging to such offices. For, though we be all priests, none

must take upon himself, without being commissioned and approved of by ourselves, to do that to which we all possess equal rights ... The office of a Christian minister ought not to be different from that of a bailiff. While he is in office he has the precedence before others; but when he is removed from office, he is a peasant or citizen like everybody else (he has not a *character indelebilis*). Nor are women excluded from the general priesthood of Christians, but they must not teach publicly (1 Cor. xiv.). But all derive their priestly office from Christ the sole high priest." See also his Appeal to the Nobles of the German Nation (in *Walch*, x. p. 302 sq.): "Hence the bishop's consecration means only this, that he takes one out of the crowd instead of the whole body, who all have like authority, and commands him to exercise this authority for the others. Just as if ten brothers, the children of the king, should elect one to govern for them; they were all kings and of equal rights, and yet one of them is appointed to rule. To set it in a clearer light, if a company of pious Christian laymen were captured and sent to a desert place, and had not among them an ordained priest, and were all agreed in the matter, and elected one, and told him to baptize, administer the mass, absolve, and preach, such an one would be as true a priest, as if all the bishops and popes had ordained him." (Comp. ibid., x. p. 1858).... "When on the other hand, the popish parsons, to prove their priesthood, show their pates and grease, and long coats to boot, we are very willing to let them boast of their dirty trumpery, for we know, that it is very easy to fleece and grease a pig or sow, and put a long coat on the animal." Comp. *Luther*, De Capt. Babyl. and his treatise: Von der Winkelmesse und der Pfaffenweihe (Wittenb. edit., vii. p. 433 ss.) Comp. *Schenkel*, as above, p. 16 sq., *Köstlin*, 59. The universal priesthood was also insisted on by *Zwingle and Calvin*. The former, in the concluding address to the first Zurich disputation (1523, see his Works, i. 199), calls the Catholic church "the wife of Christ;" "since it follows that all who love the head are members and children of God" (Thesis 8). Accordingly (Thesis 62), there are no other priests, "than those who preach God's word." Comp. Calvin's Instit. II. 15, 6; IV. 18, 13, 16, 17.—The distinction made by Protestants between *sacerdotium* and *ministerium* is very ably set forth in the Confess. Helv. II. Art. 18: Deus ad colligendam vel constituendam sibi ecclesiam, eandemque gubernandam et conservandam, semper usus est ministris, iisque utitur adhuc, et utetur porro, quoad ecclesia in terris fuerit. Ergo ministrorum origo, institutio et functio vetustissima et ipsius Dei, non nova aut hominum est ordinatio. Posset sane Deus sua potentia immediate sibi adjungere ex hominibus ecclesiam, sed maluit agere cum hominibus per ministerium hominum. Proinde spectandi sunt ministri, non ut ministri duntaxat per se, sed sicut ministri Dei, utpote per quos Deus salutem hominum operatur.... Rursus tamen et hoc cavendum est, ne ministris et ministerio *nimium* tribuamus.... Diversissima inter se sunt sacerdotium et ministerium. Illud enim commune est christianis omnibus, ut modo diximus, hoc non item. Nec e medio sustulimus ecclesiæ ministerium, quando repudiavimus ex ecclesia Christi sacerdotium papisticum. Equidem in novo testamento Christi non est amplius tale sacerdotium, quale fuit in populo vetere, quod unctionem habuit externam, vestes sacras, etc.... quæ typi fuerunt Christi, qui illa omnia

veniens et adimplens abrogavit.—In addition to piety, it is especially *theological knowledge* by which the teachers of the church must be distinguished from the laity: Eligantur autem non quilibet, sed homines idonei, eruditione justa et sacra, eloquentia pia prudentiaque simplici, denique moderatione et honestate vitæ insignes.... Damnamus ministros ineptos, et non instructos donis pastori necessariis.—As regards the right to officiate as a minister, it is necessary, also, in the Protestant Church, to be rite vocatus*: Nemo autem honorem ministerii ecclesiastici usurpare sibi, *i. e.*, ad se largitionibus, aut ullis artibus, aut arbitrio proprio, rapere debet. Vocentur et eligantur electione ecclesiastica et legitima ministri ecclesiæ, *i. e.*, eligantur religiose ab ecclesia vel ad hoc deputatis ab ecclesia, ordine justo et absque turba, seditionibus et contentione. For further passages quoted from other symbols, see *Winer*, p. 175†.

[5] On the views of the Anabaptists, see *Schenkel*, iii. 88, *sq.* *Münzer's* positions, as given by *Stobel* (Leben Münzers), p. 19, *sq.*: Quis non septies spiritu sancto profusus fuerit, Deum audire et intelligere minime potest.... Vera ecclesia est, quæ audit vocem sponsi.—The Quaker principles are given in *Barclay*, Theol. Christ. Apol. Thes. 10: Sicut dono et gratia seu lumine Dei omnis vera cognitio in rebus spiritualibus recipitur et revelatur, ita et illo, prout manifestatur et in intima cordis receptum est, per ejus vim et potentiam unusquisque verus evangelii minister constituitur, præparatur et suppeditatur in opere ministerii, et hoc movente, ducente et trahente oportet evangelistam, pastorem christianum, duci et mandari in labore et ministerio suo evangelico, et quoad loca, ubi, et quoad personas, quibus, et quoad tempora, quando ministraturus est. Porro, qui hujus habent auctoritatem, possunt et debent evangelium annunciare, licet humanis mandatis carentes et humanæ literaturæ ignari. E contra vero, qui hujus divini doni auctoritate carent, quamquam eruditione et scientia præditi et ecclesiarum mandatis et hominum auctoritate ut plurimum pollentes, impostores tantum et fraudatores, non veri evangelii ministri seu prædicatores habendi sunt. Præterea, qui sanctum et immaculatum donum acceperunt, sicut gratis accepere, ita et gratis distributuri sunt absque mercede vel pacto stipendio, absit, ut eo utantur sicut arte ad lucrandam pecuniam, etc. (Women are also permitted to teach. *Barclay*, Comment. 27.)

[6] [The Anglican literature has been very fruitful on the subject of the Church and its polity, in opposition to Rome, on the one hand, and to Presbyterian and other Protestant churches on the other hand. The question of the relation of the church to the state was also largely discussed—as, *e. g.*, on the question of passive obedience, and in the controversies with the nonjurors.—In the XXXIX. Articles, Art. XIX. *of the Church*, declares: The visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requi-

* On the different views of Lutherans and Calvinists (Ordinatio vaga) respecting ordination, see the Canon law.

† Socinians, in the doctrine about the church, follow in substance the statements of the Protestant symbols, but view the matter, when possible, in a still more external way. See *Fock's* Socinianismus, and note 2 above.

site to the same. Art. XX. declares that the church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith—yet that it is not lawful for it to ordain anything contrary to God's word. Art. XXXVI. approves the Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, as set forth in the time of Edward VI.—*Hooker's* Ecclesiastical Polity (see § 225, *b.*, note 11,) advocates the Anglican system with the greatest ability. See also, Abp. *Potter*, Disc. of Church Government, 1724 (1838). *Parker's* Government of the Church, 1683. *Jeremy Taylor*, Episcopacy Asserted. *John Rogers* (1679–1729), on the Visible and Invisible Church, 2d ed., 1719. *Bilson*, Perpetual Gov. of Church, 1593–1842. *William Nichols*, 1664–1712, Defence of Doctrine and Discipline of Church of England, 3d ed., 1730. Bp. *Robert Sanderson*, (1587–1663), Divine Right of Episcopate, and, The Church, ed. W. Goode.—*Richard Field* (1561–1616), Of the Church, 1606, fifth book, 1610, 2d ed., 1628, 1635; or Eccles. Hist. Sec. 4, Camb., 1847–52. *Thos. Jackson*, Of the Church, etc., in Works, Vol. xii. —*Thos. Brett*, (non-juror, 1667–1743), Account of Church Government, 1710; Divine Right of Episc., 2d ed., 1728.—*George Hickes* (non-juror, b. 1642, d. 1715), Treatises on Christian Priesthood and Episcopal Order, 4th ed., Oxf., 1847, 3 vols. (Libr. Angl. Cath. Theol.); he also edited Bibliotheca Script. Eccles. Anglic.—a Collection of Tracts on the Church. *Richard Cosin* (civilian), Ecclesiæ Anglic. Politeia, 1684. *Herbert Thorndike*, d. 1672, On the Government of the Churches, 1541, 1841, in Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol., 1844, vol. 1. Bp. *John Overall* (1559–1619), Convocation Book, Gov. of Church, 1690, Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol., 1844. *Peter Heylin*, Ecclesia Vindicata in Hist. Tracts, 1681. Bp. *Thos. Morton* (1564–1659), Episcopacy of Church of England Justified, 1670. *William Saywell*, The Ref. of Ch. of Eng. Justified, 1688. Bp. *Stillingfleet*, Irenicum, a Weapon-salve for the Church's Wounds, or the Divine Right of particular Forms of Church Government, 1661 (Works vol. 2). Bp. *Saml. Parker* (Oxford, b. 1640, d. 1687) Discourse of Eccles. Politie, 1670; Defence of same, 1671; Account of Government of Church for first hundred years, 1683. *Slater's* Original Draft of the Primitive Church, 1717; repr., 1830 (reply to King).—*General Works on Church Polity: Gibson's* Codex Juris Ecclesiast. 2 fol., 1764; Sir *Henry Spelman* (1562–1641), Concilia, Decreta, Constitutiones, etc., 2 fol., 1639–64. *David Wilkins* (d. 1745) Concilia; accedunt Constitutiones, etc., 4 fol., 1737. *Jos. Bingham*, Antiquities of Christ. Church, new ed., 9 vols., 1840. On the *English Convocation*, see Apb. *William Wake*, State of the Church and Clergy of England, occasioned by a book entitled The Rights and Powers of an English Convocation, fol., Lond., 1704. *Hody*, Hist. of Convocation. *G. Trevor*, Hist. of Convocation, 1853; see Christ. Rembr., 1853, and Oct., 1854.]

[7] [On the question of the position of the Church of England in respect to the recognition of the validity of the orders of other churches, see *Wm. Goode*, Vindication of the Doctrine of the Church of England, etc., 1851; republished in New York, 1853; abridged, 1860; replies by the bishop of Exeter, and Archd. Churton. See also Bp. *John Cosin*, on the Validity of Orders, etc., ed. *Goode;* and the works on the Church by Abp. *Whately*, and *Edward Arthur Litton*.—Tracts for the Times, 1833–4, No. 74, Catena

Patrum, Testimony of Writers in the English Church to the Apostolical Succession.—Bp. *Burnet*, in his Exposition of the Articles, says, that their authors, and successors for half an age after, did "acknowledge the foreign churches....to be true churches as to all essentials of the church," although somewhat "irregularly formed." Even *Hooker* concedes (Eccl. vol. vii. 14) "that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop." Clergymen from the continent, who received benefices in England, were only required to subscribe the Articles, not to be reördained. Abp. Usher said: "in places where bishops cannot be had, the ordination by presbyters standeth valid." Abp. Wake: Ecclesias Reformatas etsi in aliquibus a nostra Anglicana dissentientes libenter amplector....Interim absit ut ego tam ferrei pectoris sim, ut ob ejusmodi defectum (sic mihi absque omni invidia appellare liceat) aliquas earum a communione nostra abscindendas credam; aut, *cum quibusdam furiosis inter nos scriptoribus*, eas nulla vera ac valida sacramenta habere, adeoque vix Christianos esse pronuntiem. Letter, 1719, 4th App. to Mosheim's Eccl. Hist., transl. by Maclaine.]

[8] [On the *Controversy with Rome:* Cardinal *Bellarmine's* Notes of the Church refuted by Tenison, Kidder, Patrick, Williams, etc.; repr. 1840. *Brogden's* Catholic Safeguard (a collection of treatises) 3 vols., Lond., 1846. *Gibson* (*Edmund*, 1667–1748), Preservation against Popery (also a collection of tracts), 18 vols., Lond., 1848–9. *Jewel's* Apology. Bp. *Thos. Barlow*, (1607–91), Popery, 1679; Brutum Fulmen, 1681. *Isaac Barrow* (1630–1677), Treatise of Pope's Supremacy. *Jeremy Taylor*, Dissuasive from Popery. *Crakanthorp*, Defens. Eccles. Angl., new ed., 1847.—*Chillingworth's* Religion of Protestants (see § 225, b.) *Andrew Willett* (1562–1621), Synopsis Papismii, 5th ed., 1634, repr., 10 vols., 1852. *Roger Twysden*, Hist. Vind. of Ch. of Eng., 1657, 3d ed. *James*, Bellum Papale, 1600. 1847. Bp. *Henry Fern* (1602–1661), Ref. Church of England, against Ant. Champney, of the Sorbonne, 1653. *Henry Hammond* (1605–1660), Works 4 fol., 1774; on Schism; a Parænesis, in defence against Romanists (vol. 2). *Daniel Brevint* (d. 1695), Missale Romanum, etc. *Geo. Hickes*, Controversial Disc., and Corruptions of Church of Rome, 1705, 3d ed., 1727; he also edited Bp. *Joseph Hall* (1574–1656), in Works, vol. 8, on the Peace of Rome, etc. *Geo. Reynolds*, Hist. Essay on Gov. of Church of England, 1743. *Andrew Sall*, d. 1682, True Cath. and Apostolic Faith, new ed. by Allport, 1840. *Francis Mason* (1566–1621), Vindiciæ Eccles. Anglicanæ, against Bellarmine, etc., fol., 1638; transl., 1728. Bp. *John Buckridge* (of Ely, d. 1631), De Potestate Papæ in rebus temporalibus, Lond., 1614. Abp. *John Sharp* (1644–1714), Works, vol. 7 (1754), on Roman Cath. controversy. Abp. *Wm. Laud* (1573–1645), Relation of Conference with Mr. Fisher, 1624; in Works, vol. 2, Oxf., 1849; Rome's Masterpiece (in Remains,) by *Wharton*, fol. 1700, vol. i. p. 567, *sq.* *Francis White*, d. 1638, Reply to Jesuit Fisher, etc., 1624. *Nathl. Spinckes* (non-juror, b. 1653 or 1654, d. 1727), Essay on Cath. Communion in Union with Rome, 1705. Bp. *Ed. Stillingfleet*, Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion, 2d ed., 1681 (Works, vol. 4). *William Sherlock*, Preservative against Popery; Summary of Controversies; on Bellarmine's Notes. *Dean Hum-*

phrey Prideaux, Ecclesiastical Tracts; Validity of Orders of Ch. of England against Papists, 1688. *Thos. Brown*, Story of the Ordination at Nag's Head, 1731. *Peter Francis Courayer* (b. 1681, d. 1776), Diss. on Validity of English Ordinations, and Defence of the same, new ed., Oxf., 1844. *William Cave* (1637–1713), Diss. on Gov. of Ancient Church, 1683. Abp. *Wm. Wake*, Continuation of the Controversy between Church of England and Rome; being a full account of the books published on both sides, Lond., 1688.]

[9] [Presbyterian Church Government. Ratio ac Forma publice orandi Deum, etc., Genev., 1556, (drawn up by the English exiles in the Marian Persecution.) *George Gillespie*, Aaron's Rod blossoming, or the Divine Ordinance of Church Government. Publ. by authority, Lond., 1646. *Cartwright*, vs. abp. Whitgift. *Smectymnus*, An Answer to Bp. Hall's Divine Right of Episcopacy (the authors, whose initial letters make up the name of the book, were Steph. Marshall, Edm. Calamy, Thos. Young, Matth. Newcomen, and Wm. Spurstowe). *John Milton* wrote an Apology for Smectymnus; also a work on Prelatical Episcopacy against Wall and Usher; Reason of Church Gov. against Prelacy. *Edm. Calamy*, Vind. of Presb. Government, 1654. London Ministers, Jus Divinum Regiminis Eccles., 1646. Divine Right of Church Gov., new ed., 1799; repr. New York, 1844. *Ayton's* Original Constitution of the Church. *Peter King* (Lord Chancellor) b. 1669, d. 1733, Inquiry into the Constitution of the Prim. Ch. (anon.), 1812, often reprinted, is favorable to the Presbyterian view.—Among the opponents of Presbyterians in the Church of England, were *Henry Hammond*, Vind. Episc. Dissert. quatuor (against Blondel); *H. Dodwell*, Separation of Churches, 1679; Bp. *Sanderson*, Puritan Prejudices against Clergy of Church of England; *F. Brokesby* (1657–1715) Hist. of Gov. of Prim. Ch. (against Blondel); Bp. *Henry Fern*, Episc. and Presb., 1647; The Case as it Stands, 1655; Bp. *John Sage* (of Scotland), b. 1652, d. 1711, Charter of Presb., and Principles of Cyprianic Age; *Peter Heylin*, Aërius Redivivus, Hist. Presb., 2d ed., 1672; Bp. *Wm. Lloyd*, Hist. Account of Church Gov. (against Blondel), 2d ed., 1700; Bp. *Ed. Stillingfleet*, Unreasonableness of Separation, 2d ed., 1681 (Works, vol. 2); *Wm. Sherlock*, Defence of the same, 1675; Disc. of Church Unity, 1681–2.]

[10] [*John Cotton* (see § 225, *b.*, note 44), Doctrine of Church to which are committed the Keys, etc., Lond., 2d ed., 1643, 1644; Vindiciæ Clavium; Way of the Churches, against Baylie and Rutherford, 1648. Cotton's work made a convert of *John Owen;* he had previously brought *Thos. Goodwin* and *Philip Nye* over to his views. Robinson's church, and the Plymouth church were formed on this basis. See *Owen's* Nature and Gov. of the Gospel Church, and other treatises in his works, vols. xv. xvi. *Thos. Goodwin* (b. 1600, d. 1679), Works, 5 fol., Lond., 1681; Constitution and Gov. of the Churches of Christ, vol. vi., 1–408, and other works in the same volume. *Thos. Hooker* (see ante, p. 192), Survey of Summe of Church Discipline, 1648.—*Thos. Shepard* (ante, p. 192), Power of Keys, 1653. *John Wise*, (Ipswich, New Engl.) Churches Quarrel, 1710; Vindication of Gov. of Churches, 1715; fourth ed., Boston, Congregational Board, 1860. Cambridge Platform, 1648. Saybrook Platform, 1708.]

The definitions concerning the relation in which the *church* stands to the *state*, depend on those concerning the nature of the church. According to *Bellarmine's* definition, before mentioned, the Roman Catholic Church is a state quite as much as the Republic of Venice, etc. Accordingly, it is independent of every other (secular) state.—The Protestants also maintained that the church, as the kingdom of God, is independent of all secular power, and when they committed the government of the visible church more or less into the hands of the state, they had not the intention of founding for it that system of *cesaropapacy* subsequently established [in which the sovereign took the place of the pope]. In the historical point of view, it was of the greatest importance, that the reformers, in an age so full of commotions, should endeavour to maintain the authority of secular power, as "an institution ordained by God," *first*, by securing it against the pretensions of the hierarchy, which undermined the existence of every state; and, *secondly*, by an energetic opposition to the anarchical notions of the Anabaptists. Thus it happened that, in most confessions of faith, the article, De Magistratu, was laid down as a political and moral principle. And inasmuch as the reformers, at the same time, proceeded on the idea of a *Christian* magistracy (analogous to the theocratic kings of the Old Testament), some, *e. g. Zwingle*, were of opinion, that the exercise of *ecclesiastical discipline* (the "abolition of crimes") might well be left to the magistrate, without making it necessary to have a distinct ecclesiastical court, while others, as *Œcolampadius* and *Calvin*, retained the ecclesiastical institution of excommunication, but reduced it to its primitive apostolical form. Comp. Schröckh, Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation, iii. p. 84. *Henry's* Calvin, ii. p. 97, *Schenkel*, iii. 338 sq.—According to the first Confess. of Basle, Art. 7, the Christian Church inflicts the punishment of excommunication "*only as a corrective, and gladly receives the excommunicated persons back into her fellowship, when they have amended their scandalous life.*" For further passages from the symbolical books of the Protestant Churches, see *Winer*, p. 180. On the controversy begun by *Thomas Erastus* (Liebler) of Heidelberg and the disputation which took place A. D. 1568, see *Beckhaus*, über den Heidelberger Katechismus, l. c. p. 90 ss. Athenæ Raur. p. 428. *Vierordt*, Gesch. der Reform. in Grossh. Baden, p. 474 sq. [*J. R. Prettyman*, The Church of England and Erastianism, Lond. 1854. *Pusey*, on Royal Supremacy, 1849. *W. G. Gladstone*, The State in its Relations with the Church, 2 vols., 4th ed., 1841. Comp. also the debates in the Westminster Assembly; and *Hetherington's* History of the same.] A question of practical importance arose on the point, how far the civil power should coöperate in the suppression of heresy or error? While in the Wartburg Luther warned the Elector about staining himself with the blood of the false prophets. And he also tanght, that "heresy belongs to spiritual things, and can not be hewed with iron, or burnt with fire, or strangled in water" (see *Köstlin*, p. 187). To this was opposed the procedure of the governments in the case of the Anabaptists and Anti-Trinitarians (Servetus). And yet they were defended by theologians, particularly in the Calvinistic Church. See the discussions about it in *Trechsel*, Servetus, p. 265 sq.

§ 256.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE CHURCH.

Later Protestant theologians developed more fully the difference between *ecclesia visibilis* and *ecclesia invisibilis* (in addition to which the other distinction between *ecclesia militans* and *ecclesia triumphans* continued to be made). The *ecclesia visibilis* is either *universalis* (*i. e.* scattered through the world), or *particularis* (*i. e.* some church which has adopted a particular form). The particular churches are either opposed to, or stand on friendly terms with, each

other.[1] As regards the organization of the visible church (ecclesia synthetica), the Lutheran divines made a distinction between the status ecclesiasticus, the status politicus, and the status œconomicus. Different views obtained among Calvinists;[2] nor did they agree with the Lutherans as to the representation of the church (ecclesia repræsentativa). But these formal distinctions were of less importance than the new life which *Spener* brought into the church, by restoring the Protestant doctrine of a spiritual priesthood,[3] and the work which *Thomasius* performed by advocating the so-called territorial system.[4] The mystics and enthusiasts offered, like the sects of the middle ages, a constant opposition to all ecclesiastical establishments, both Roman Catholic and Protestant.[5]

[1] The passages relative to this distinction are quoted from the works of the Protestant theologians by *De Wette* (Dogmatik p. 191, ss.), and *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 320, ss.

[2] See *Wendelin*, *Alsted*, and *Heidegger*, quoted by *De Wette*, l. c. p. 195. —For the different forms of church government (*e. g.* the government of the church by consistories [in the Lutheran Church], Presbyterianism, Independency, etc.), see the Canon law.

[3] He advanced his views in his work entitled: *Das geistliche Priesterthum, aus göttlichem Wort kürzlich beschrieben und mit einem einstimmigen Zeugnisse gottseliger Lehrer bekräftigt*, Frankf., 1677, 8 (arranged in questions and answers). P. 7, Qu. 11: "Does the title of priest belong to none but preachers? Answ. No; preachers are not properly speaking, priests, nor is that title applied to them in the New Test.; but they are called servants of Christ, stewards of the mysteries of God, bishops, presbyters, servants of the gospel, of the Word of God, etc. The name priest is rather a name common to all Christians, nor does it belong to ministers in a different sense from that in which it belongs to other Christians." 12. "But are not the priests alone the 'Geistlichen?'" [the word "Geistlichen" has a twofold signification, *i. e.*, one who is spiritually minded, and, clergymen.] Answ. "No; for this title also belongs to every Christian (Rom. viii. 5.)—Sacrificing, praying, and blessing, are priestly offices which every Christian may perform, and concerning which Christ alone possesses the dignity of high priest."—Nevertheless Spener admitted, like all Protestants, the necessity of the ministry. Qu. 26. "Are all Christians ministers, and are all called upon to preach?" Answ. "No; it requires a particular vocation to fulfil the ministerial duties in the congregation *before* all, and *over* all, its members; therefore he who of himself assumes such powers over others, and encroaches upon the rights of the minister, commits sin; hence teachers and hearers are different persons," etc. (On the other hand, the laity possess the full right of searching the Scriptures. See § 243, note 7).

[4] According to *Thomasius*, the reigning prince possesses the right of regulating the ecclesiastical affairs of his country of banishing persons who disturb the peace of the church, etc. But he himself cannot be subject to

ecclesiastical discipline. Thomasius, however, did not give his unqualified assent to the principle of Hobbes: Cujus regio, illius religio. Comp. his treatise: Von dem Recht evangelischer Fürsten in Mitteldingen oder Kirchenceremoniem; it appeared 1692, in Latin, and was afterwards translated into German; compare also the treatise entitled: Das Recht evangelischer Fürsten in theologischen Streitigkeiten, 1696; and other works, referred to by *Schröckh*, Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation, vii. p. 541, and *Luden*, l. c.

[6] *Böhme*, *Kuhlmann*, *Gichtel*, *Labadie*, *Anna Schurmann*, *Poiret*, and others, vied with each other in attacks upon the established church and its ministers. *Poiret* called the theology of the latter, Theologia adulatoria seu culinaria: see Arnold iii. p. 166. *J. Böhme*, heaped reproaches upon the priests of Baal.

§ 257.

ADORATION OF SAINTS AND IMAGES.

The reformers combated the invocation and adoration of saints, but the theologians of the Roman Catholic as well as the Greek Church retained the practice, and endeavored to defend it with the arguments brought forward at an earlier period by the scholastics,[2] or to vindicate it against the charge of idolatry, by making use of idealising interpretation.[3] The same may be said with regard to the adoration of images and relics,[4] as well as ecclesiastical ceremonies in general. In all these particulars Calvinists carried their opposition farther than Lutherans.[5]

[1] The Protestants did not teach that *there are no saints at all*, but only rejected their invocation. See *Marheincke*, Symbolik, iii. p. 439. Conf. August. Art. 21: De cultu Sanctorum docent, quod memoria Sanctorum proponi potest, ut imitemur fidem eorum et bona opera juxta vocationem. Sed Scriptura non docet invocare Sanctos seu petere auxilium a Sanctis, quia unum Christum nobis proponit mediatorem, propitiatorium, pontificem et intercessorem: hic invocandus est et promisit se exauditurum esse preces nostras, et hunc cultum maxime probat. Comp. Apol. p. 223.—The Articles of Smalcald use much stronger terms, p. 310: Invocatio Sanctorum est etiam pars absurda errorum Antichristi, pugnans cum primo principali articulo et delens agnitionem Christi.—Similar principles are laid down in the confessions of faith adopted by the Calvinists, Arminians, and Socinians; see *Winer*, p. 47. [Bp. *Ridley*, Treatise on Image-Worship, in Tracts of Anglican Fathers, vol. ii.; Abp. Wake, on Idolatry, in Gibson's Preservative, vol. vi.; *Freeman*, *Claggett*, and *Whitby*, on Worship of Saints, ibid., vol. vii.]

[2] Conc. Trid. Sess. 25: (Doceant episcopi) Sanctos una cum Christo regnantes orationes suas pro hominibus Deo afferre, *bonum atque utile esse*,*

* Hence the invocation of saints is not made a *necessary condition of salvation*.

suppliciter eos invocare et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per filium ejus Jesum Christum, qui solus noster redemtor et salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere; illos vero, qui negant, Sanctos æterna felicitate in cœlo fruentes invocandos esse, aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare, vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent, invocationem esse idololatriam, vel pugnare cum verbo Dei adversarique honore unius mediatoris Dei et hominum Jesu Christi, vel stultum esse, in cœlo regnantibus voce vel mente supplicare, impie sentire.—Concerning the *angels*, the Catech. Rom. 3, 2, 10. asserts: Invocandi sunt, quod et perpetuo Deum intuentur et patrocinium salutis nostræ sibi delatum libentissime suscipiunt. —The Roman Catholics also retained the distinction made by the scholastics between *invocatio* and *adoratio*.—For the symbols of the Greek Church see *Winer*, p. 44–46.

[3] This was done *e. g.* by *Bossuet*, Exposition de la Doctrine de l'église catholique, Pag. 19: The Church, in teaching us the utility of addressing prayers to the saints, commands us to invoke them in the same spirit, and in accordance with the same law of society, which induces us to seek assistance from our brethren upon earth....Pag. 27: It is in this manner that we honor the saints, in order to obtain by their intercession all the graces of God; the principal grace which we hope to obtain is that by which we shall be enabled to imitate them; to this we are also excited by the contemplation of their admirable examples, and by the honorable mention of their blessed memory which we make before God. Those who will consider the doctrine which we propound, will be compelled to acknowledge that we neither take from God any of those perfections which are essential to his infinite essence, nor ascribe to created beings any of those qualities or operations which belong to none but God himself; there is therefore such a great difference between us and idolaters, that it is difficult to perceive why our opponents give us that name....Pag. 30. And, lastly, no Roman Catholic (?!) ever thought that the saints of themselves know our wants, nor even the desires on account of which we address to them secret prayers. The Church has been content to teach, in accordance with all antiquity, that such prayers are very useful to those who offer them, whether the saints may hear of them by the medium of the ministry and intercourse of the angels, who, according to Scripture, know what happens among men.... whether God himself makes known our wishes to them by means of a particular revelation, or, lastly, reveals to them our secret desires in his infinite essence, which comprehends all truth. Thus the Church has decided nothing as to the different means which God may be pleased to use for this purpose.

[4] Comp. *Winer*, p. 47, ss., where the passages bearing upon this point are quoted from the symbolical writings.

[5] *Luther's* sermon against the Iconoclasts of Wittenberg.—Similar principles to those adopted by Luther were defended by *Schmid* in the disputation of Zurich; but his views were not adopted. During the period of the Interim, the Lutheran Church returned to many of the ceremonies of the Romish Church, which gave rise to the *Adiaphoristic* controversy.—The minor sects followed the example of the Reformed Church.

§ 258.

THE SACRAMENTS.

The doctrine of *seven sacraments*, which both the Greek and Roman Churches adopted,[1] was rejected by the reformers, who admitted (after some wavering), as scriptural only *two sacraments*[2] —viz., those of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper.[3] These two, together with the Word of God,[4] constitute, in the Protestant view, the means of grace (adminicula gratiæ) which profit only believers ;[5] on the contrary, the theologians of the Roman Catholic Church asserted the efficacy of the sacraments ex opere operato.[6] But both Roman Catholics and Protestants agreed to the necessity of sacraments (in opposition to Quakers),[7] and their higher significance as the medium by which spiritual blessings are communicated (in opposition to Arminians, Mennonites, and Socinians, who regard them as mere ceremonies).[8] Only the strict Zwinglian theory limited the sacraments to the idea of a mere symbol of duty.[9]

[1] Conc. Trid. Sess. 7, can. 1 : Si quis dixerit sacramenta sacræ legis.... esse plura vel pauciora quam septem, videlicet baptismum, confirmationem, eucharistiam, pœnitentiam, extremam unctionem, ordinem et matrimonium, aut etiam aliquod horum septem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum : anathema sit.—The reasons why the number seven is fixed upon are more fully developed in Catech. Rom. ii. 1, 20, quoted by *Winer*, p. 123, where their respective dignity is also determined, ii. 1, 22 : Sacramenta non parem omnia et æqualem necessitatem aut dignitatem habent, atque ex iis tria sunt, quæ, tametsi non eadem ratione, tamen præ ceteris necessaria dicuntur, baptismus, pœnitentia, ordo ; verum si dignitas in sacramentis spectetur, eucharistia sanctitate et mysteriorum numero ac magnitudine longe cæteris antecellit. Conf. Orth. p. 154 : Ἑπτὰ *μυστήρια τῆς ἐκκλησίας, τὰ ὁποῖα εἶναι ταῦτα· τὸ βάπτισμα, τὸ μύρον τοῦ χρίσματος, ἡ εὐχαριστία, ἡ μετάνοια, ἡ ἱερωσύνη, ὁ τίμιος γάμος καὶ τὸ εὐχέλαιον· ταῦτα τὰ ἑπτὰ μυστήρια ἀναβιβάζονται εἰς τὰ ἑπτὰ χαρίσματα τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.* The Greeks, however, considered baptism and the Lord's Supper the principal sacraments, to which some added penance. Comp. *Winer*, p. 124.

[2] At first *Melancthon* even doubted about the propriety of making use of the word *sacrament* (which is not found in the Bible) ; see his Loci Communes, 1521 (in the Corpus Ref., ed. Bretschneider, p. 210) : Quæ alii sacramenta, nos *signa* adpellamus, aut, si ita libet, signa *sacramentalia*, nam sacramentum ipsum Christum Paulus vocat.

[3] The two Catechisms of Luther and the Confession of Augsburg treat only of two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, without excluding the other five. *Melancthon* would have allowed ordination and marriage to be sacraments (see *Thiersch*, ii. p. 206), and he even admitted absolution (Apol. p. 167) : Absolutio proprie dici potest sacramentum. But comp. the

Loci, 1521 (Corp. Ref., p. 211): Duo sunt autem signa a Christo in Evangelio instituta: baptismus et participatio mensæ Domini. *Luther* also spoke of three sacraments in his De Captiv. Babyl.: Baptismus, Pœnitentia, Panis. On the contrary in the Catech. Major, p. 549, penance is included in baptism. The Apol. Conf., p. 200, is opposed to regarding seven as the fixed number: Sed hic [adversarii] jubent nos etiam septem sacramenta numerare. Nos sentimus præstandum esse, negligentur res in ceremoniæ in Scripturis institutæ, quotcunque sunt. Nec multum referre putamus, etiamsi docendi causa alii numerent aliter, si tamen recte conservent res in Scriptura traditas. —Yet the Apology also mentions penance among the sacraments: Vere igitur sunt sacramenta baptismus, cœna Domini, absolutio, quæ est sacramentum pœnitentiæ.—The number two is in re definitely stated in the symbolical writings of the Reformed Church. Confess. Basil. I., Art. 5, § 2: In this church we use only one kind of sacrament—viz. baptism, by which we are received into the Church, and the Lord's Supper in after life, as a testimony of faith and brotherly love, according to our promise in baptism.—Conf. Helv. II., c. 19: Novi populi sacramenta sunt baptismus et cœna dominica. Sunt qui sacramenta novi populi septem numerent. Ex quibus nos pœnitentiam, ordinationem ministrorum, non papisticam quidam illam, sed apostolicam, et matrimonium agnoscimus *instituta esse Dei utilia, sed non sacramenta.* Confirmatio et extrema unctio *inventa sunt hominum*, quibus nullo cum damno carere potest ecclesia. Comp. Conf. Gall., Art. 35, Belg. 33. Calvin, Instit. iv., c. 19. [Anglican (XXXIX. Art.) Art. 25: Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.—There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.—Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.—The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith.—This Article as it now stands, is largely altered from its form in Edward the VIth's Articles: Archb. *Parker* in 1562 inserted the clause against the Popish sacraments, employing the phrase "extreme annoyling;" for this, Bishop *Jewel*, 1571 substituted "unction." See *Kidd* on Thirty-nine Articles, p. 241.]

[Westminster Confession; chapter xxvii.: Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace, immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ and his benefits, and to confirm our interest in him: as also to put a visible difference between those that belong unto the church, and the rest of the world: and solemnly to engage them to the service of God in Christ,

according to his word. 2. There is in every sacrament a spiritual relation or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified, whence it comes to pass, that the names and effects of the one, are attributed to the other. 4. There be only two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord: neither of which may be dispensed by any, but a minister of the word, lawfully ordained.] The Arminians also had only two sacraments. The Mennonites made mention of the washing of feet as a usage instituted by Christ (according to John xii.); but *Ries*, Conf., Art. 30, spoke only of two sacraments. Comp. *Winer*, p. 124.

[4] In the view of Protestants, the sacred Scriptures are not only the source of knowledge, but the Word of God contained in them is a living and quickening principle. Both the law and the gospel have each their peculiar ἐνέργεια, the former that of bringing men to the knowledge of sin, the latter that of being the medium through which grace is bestowed on them (Art. of Smalcald, p. 319).—The Catech. Rom. (iv. 13, 18) also speaks of the Word of God as a cibus animi, and places it on the same level with the sacraments, but understands by it the *prædicatio verbi* as sanctioned by the Church, rather than the *Scriptures*.

[5] Confess. August. p. 11: Per verbum et sacramenta, tanquam per instrumenta, donatur Spir. S., qui fidem efficit, ubi et quando visum est Deo, in iis qui audiunt evangelium, etc. Comp. Cat. Maj. p. 426, Art. Smalcald, p. 331, Form. Concord. p. 670.—Conf. Helv. II. cap. 1. Belg. 24.—Heidelberg. Catechism, Qu. 65: Whence cometh (justifying) faith? Answ. The Holy Spirit produces it in our hearts by the preaching of the gospel, and confirms it by the use of the sacraments.*—On the other hand, the Protestant symbols are equally definite against the Roman Catholic doctrine. Confess. Aug. p. 13: Damnant illos, qui docent, quod sacramenta, *ex opere operato* justificent, nec docent fidem requiri in usu sacramentorum, quæ credat remitti peccata. Apol. p. 203: Damnamus totum populum scholasticorum doctorum, qui docent, quod sacramenta non ponenti obicem conferant gratiam *ex opere operato*, sine bono motu utentis. Hæc simpliciter judaïca opinio est, sentire, quod per ceremoniam justificemur, sine bono motu cordis, *h. e.* sine fide....At sacramenta sunt *signa* promissionum. Igitur in usu debet accedere fides....Loquimur hic de fide speciali, quæ præsenti promissioni credit, non tantum, quæ in genere credit, Deum esse, sed quæ credit offerri remissionem peccatorum.—Helv. II. c. 19: Neque vero approbamus istorum doctrinam, qui docent, gratiam et res significatas signis ita alligari et includi, ut quicunque signis exterius participent, etiam interius gratiæ rebusque significatis participes sint, qualesquales sint....Minime probamus eos, qui sanctificationem sacramentorum attribuunt nescio quibus characteribus et recitationi vel virtuti verborum pronuntiatorum a consecratore et qui habeat intentionem consecrandi.—But Protestant theologians also taught that the *integritas* of the sacrament did not depend on the dignity either of

* This in allusion to the enthusiasts.—On the division of the means of grace into δοτικὰ καὶ ληπτικὰ (Quenstedt, Syst., iv., p. 281), see *Gass*, i. 372 [the former as offered to man, the latter as received by man.]

the person who administered it, or of him who receives it. Conf. Helvet l. c. [Westminster Conf. above, Thirty-Nine Articles, XXVI.: Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their Ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.—Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the church, that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those who have knowledge of their offences; and, finally, being found guilty, by just judgment, be deposed.]

[6] Conc. Trid. Sess. 7, can. 8: Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, sed solam fidem divinæ promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere: anathema sit.—The further development of this doctrine by *Bellarmine*, De Sacram. ii. 1, is given by *Winer*, p. 125. Against the objections of the Protestants, Conc. Trident. sess. xiv. c. 4: Quamobrem falso quidam calumniantur catholicos scriptores, quasi tradiderint, sacramentum pœnitentiæ absque bono motu suscipientium gratiam conferre, quod nunquam Ecclesia docuit neque sensit. See *Thiersch*, Protest. p. 210.

[7] The Quakers reject both the idea and the name of a sacrament. They only acknowledge spiritual baptism and a mystical Lord's Supper. *Barclay*, Apol. xii. 12, quoted by *Winer*, p. 120.

[8] See the passages quoted by Winer, pp. 122, 123, and compare the following §. The difference referred to may (after the example of Winer) be so defined, that according to the Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists, *God bestows* something on man by the medium of the sacrament, while those sects taught that *man renders* something to God (or testifies to something in the presence of men *before* God). Yet the idea of service on man's part is also contained in the Catholic view of sacrifice. See the next section.

[9] *Zwingle*, De vera et falsa Relig. p. 231: Sunt sacramenta signa vel *ceremoniæ* (pace tamen omnium dicam, sive neotericorum sive veterum), quibus se homo ecclesiæ probat aut candidatum aut militem esse Christi, redduntque ecclesiam totam potius certiorem de tua fide, quam te; si enim fides tua non aliter fuerit absoluta, quam ut *signo ceremoniali* ad confirmationem egeat, fides non est: fides enim est, qua nitimur misericordiæ Dei inconcusse, firmiter et indistracte, ut multis locis Paulus habet. Comp. Fidei Rat. ad Carol. V.: Credo omnia sacramenta tam abesse ut gratiam conferant, ut ne afferant quidem aut dispensent.... Credo, sacramentum esse sacræ rei *h. e. factæ gratiæ* signum.—Klare Underrichtung vom Nachtmahl Christi (Works ii. 1) p. 429: "A sacrament is the sign of a sacred thing.

* This does not harmonize with the caption given by *Schenkel*, i. 412 sq. "*The Deprecation of the Sacrament by the Reformed.*"

....Now the priests well knew that this word *sacrament* denotes nothing but a sign, nevertheless they left the simple-minded in the mistaken idea, that it was something else, or something very precious, which they (the simple-minded) did not understand, but were induced to believe that the sacrament was God himself." Annot. in Evang. Matth. (Opera, vi. p. 373): Ad hoc enim Christus sacramenta instituit, non ut his jam justitiam quæreremus aut collocaremus, sed ut per hæc admoniti et excitati ad veram cordis adeoque fidei justitiam penetraremus. Signa enim externa non justificant, ut quidam perhibent, sed justificationis per fidem admonent et vitæ innocentiam excitant.—Annot. in Evang. Marci, ib. p. 554: Nequaquam rejicienda sacramenta quæ Deus instituit, *sed summa cum religione et veneratione tractanda.** Verum his tribuere quod solius est Dei, non minus est impium. Comp. his Expositio Fidei (Opera, iv. 2, p. 56): Sacramenta res sanctæ et venerandæ sunt, utpote a summo sacerdote Christo institutæ et susceptæ....Testimonium rei gestæ præbent....Vice rerum sunt, quas significant, unde et nomina eorum sortiuntur....Res arduas significant. Ascendit autem cujusque signi pretium cum æstimatione rei, cujus est signum, ut si res sit magna, pretiosa et amplifica, jam signum ejus rei eo majus reputetur. (Annulus reginæ uxoris tuæ, quo eam despondit tua majestas, illi non auri pretio æstimatur, sed pretium omne superat, etc.)....Auxilium opemque afferunt fidei....Vice jurisjurandi sunt. [See, further, in *Christoffel's* Zwingle, *Cochran's* translation, 1858, seventh section.]—Comp. the Catechism of *Leo Judæ* (*Grab's* edition), p. 227: "As Christ will not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax, he has appointed for us, his members, while here in the flesh, two external *signs of duty*, that our timidity may abate." Page 329: "A sacrament is an *oath*, or *sacred duty:* those who speak to us of holy matters have called it a sign of sacred things, to present and image forth these things to us; whereby, too, those who make use of it *bind* and pledge themselves to these same holy things."—Calvin unfolds the idea of the sacrament in the 4th Book of his Institutes, cap. 14. He defines the sacrament, in § 1, the externum symbolum, quo benevolentiæ erga nos suæ promissiones conscientiis nostris Dominus obsignat, ad sustinendam fidei nostræ imbecillitatem, et nos vicissim pietatem erga eum nostram tam coram eo et angelis quam apud homines testamur. § 3: Ex hac definitione intelligimus, nunquam sine præeunte promissione esse sacramentum, sed ei potius tamquam appendicem quandam adjungi, eo fine, ut promissionem suam confirmet ac obsignet, nobisque testatiorem, imo ratam quodammodo faciat: quo modo nostræ ignorantiæ ac tarditati primum, deinde infirmitati opus esse Deus providet: neque tamen (proprie loquendo) tam ut sacrum suum sermonem firmet, quam ut nos in ipsius fide stabiliat, siquidem Dei veritas per' se satis solida certaque est, nec aliunde meliorem confirmationem, quam a se ipsa accipere potest. Verum ut exigna est et imbecilla nostra fides, nisi undique fulciatur, ac modis omnibus sustentetur, statim concutitur, fluctuatur, vacillat adeoque labascit. § 9: Quamobrem ....velim lectorem....non quasi *arcanam vim nescio quam* illis perpetuo insitam putem, qua fidem *per se* promovere aut confirmare valeant, sed quia

* This does not harmonize with the caption given by *Schenkel*, i. 412 sq., viz., "*The Depreciation of the Sacrament by the Reformed.*"

sunt in hoc a Domino instituta, ut stabiliendæ augendæque fidei serviant.—§ 12, he calls sacraments *pignora*. He refutes not only those who despise the sacraments, but also those (§ 14), qui arcanos nescio quas virtutes sacramentis affingunt, quæ nusquam illis a Deo insitæ leguntur.—The substance of the sacraments (materia et substantia) is Christ himself (§ 16); they have in him their *soliditas*. They are nothing, separated from him.—Calvin does not hold to a specific difference between the sacraments and the Word. § 17: Quamobrem fixum maneat, non esse alias sacramentorum quam verbi Dei partes: quæ sunt offerre nobis ac proponere Christum, et in eo cœlestis gratiæ thesaurus: nihil autem conferunt aut prosunt nisi fide accepta.—He also calls the Old Testament types (Noah's rainbow, etc.), sacraments (§ 18), and only distinguishes them from the New Testament sacraments by the fact that the former represent the promised Messiah in type, the latter testify to him in fact (§ 20). Comp. § 26: Utraque paternam Dei in Christo benevolentiam ac Spiritus Sancti gratias nobis offerri testantur; sed nostra illustrius ac luculentius. In utrisque Christi exhibitio; sed in his uberior ac plenior. Comp. *Schenkel*, i. 425, *sq.*, and the passages there adduced.

§ 259.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Lavater, L. Historia Controversiæ Sacramentariæ. Tigur., 1563, 1672. *Hospiniani, H.* Historia Sacramentaria, Tigur., 1598, 1602, ii. f., 1611, 4. The Works of *Luther* (*Walch*, vol. xvii, xx.) *Ebrard's* Abendmahl, ii.; *M. Göbel*, Luther's Abendmahlslehre vor und in dem Streite mit Carlstadt (Stud. u. Kritiken, 1843). *Julius Müller*, Lutheri et Calvini Sententiæ de sacra Cœna inter se comparatæ, Hal. 1853, 4to. *A. W. Dieckhoff*, Die Evangelische Abendmahls lehre in Reformations zeit alter, Götting. 1854. [*K. F. A. Kahnis*, Die Lehre von Abendmahle, 1851. *L. J. Rückert*, Das Abendmahl, Wesen, Geschichte, Leipz. 1856: comp. *Baur*, in Theol. Jahrb. 1857: and *Rückert* in Zeitschrift f. wiszenchafl. Theologie, 1858.—*John Cosin*, Hist. of Popish Transubstantiation, new ed. by J. Brewer, 1851. *Jeremy Taylor*, The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ, against Transubstant. (Works, vol. ix, x). See also the works of *Hooker*, Abp. *Bramhall* and Bishop *Andrews*, for the doctrine of the Church of England. *Hampden's* Bampton Lectures (viii). *W. Wright*, Doctrine of Real Presence in the Divines of the Church of England, 2 Parts, 1855. *E. B. Pusey*, The Real Presence, the Doctrine of the English Church, with Vindication of the Reception of the Wicked, and of the Adoration of Jesus Christ truly present, 1857: ibid., The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent, a Sermon, 1843. *W. Goode*, The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, 2, 1856 (against Pusey, and in the Denison case). *R. J. Wilberforce*, Doctrine of Eucharist, 1853. Tracts for the Times, No. 81.]

While the Reformers made common cause in their opposition not only to the doctrine of transubstantiation,[1] but especially to the sacrifice of the mass,[2] and the witholding of the cup from the laity,[3] all of which they rejected as unscriptural, they still differed widely in their opinions concerning the positive aspect of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Different interpretations of the words pronounced

by our Saviour at the institution of this sacrament were at short intervals advanced by *Carlstadt*,[4] *Zwingle*,[5] and *Œcolampadius*.[6] *Luther* opposed all these, in his controversial writings,[7] and in the *Colloquium of Marburg* (1529, Oct.),[8] and even to the close of his life. He insisted upon the literal interpretation of the words of the institution of the Supper; and, as a consequence, upon the actual reception with the mouth of the glorified body of Christ, present in the bread, and of his real blood. In accordance with his views the authors of the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church declared the doctrine of the *real presence* of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist (*Consubstantiation*), and along with it (in part) that of the *ubiquity* of his body,[9] to be the orthodox doctrine of the Church.[10] The divines of the Reformed Church never denied a presence of Christ in the Eucharist, though they did not expressly emphasize it.[11] But they did not look for this presence, testified by *faith*, in the bread, and interpreted the reception of Christ in the ordinance, not as that of his body received by the mouth, but as a spiritual participation.[12] *Calvin*[13] in particular, after the precedence of Bucer, emphasized this spiritual participation, and thus made the Lord's Supper not a mere sign, but a seal and pledge of divine grace imparted to the communicants. Thus there always remained this important difference, that even in Calvin's view, it is only the believer who is united with Christ in the sacrament; and that the body of Christ, as such, is not in the bread, but in heaven, from whence, in a mysterious and dynamic way it is imparted to the communicant; while, on the contrary, Luther, from the objective point of view, maintained that the unbelieving also partake of the body of Christ, *in*, *with*, and *under the bread*, though they do it to their own hurt.[14] The view of *Schwenkfeld*,[15] resting upon a perversion of the words of the institution, had but slight influence. The most prosaic view is that of the Socinians, Arminians, and Mennonites, who, in connection with their more negative opinions on the nature of the sacraments, regarded the Lord's Supper merely as an act of commemoration.[16] And, lastly, the Quakers believed, that in consequence of their internal and spiritual union with Christ, they might wholly dispense with partaking of his body.[17] [The Westminister Confession is in harmony with the views of Calvin:[18] the Independents and Baptists adopted substantially the theory of Zwingle. The Church of England laid more stress upon the real presence, and upon the idea of the eucharistic sacrifice.[19]]

[1] *Luther* combated the idea of transubstantiation both in his treatise De Captiv. Babyl., and in his controversy with Henry VIII., who defended the scholastic doctrine. (Comp. Walch, xix.) [Henry VIII.: Adsertio septem sacramentorum adversus Mart. Lutherum. Lond., 1521, 4to. Rom., 1521 (the Pope granted to Henry in consequence the title Defensor Fidei); transl.

by T. W., Lond., 1687. In 1526, Literarum quibus invictissimus Princeps, Henricus octavus.... Fidei Defensor, respondit ad quandam Epistolam Mart. Luth., etc., 1526.] Yet Luther himself made use of the expression transubstantiation (Verwandlung) in his Sermon on the Venerable Sacrament, 1519, (cited in *Ebrard*, ii. 112). The Symbols also declare against transubstantiation. Art. Smalcald, p. 330 :.... De transsubstantiatione subtilitatem sophisticam nihil curamus, qua fingunt, panem et vinem relinquere et amittere naturalem suam substantiam et tantum speciem et colorem panis et non verum panem remanere.—Form. Conc., p. 729 : Extra usum dum reponitur aut asservatur (panis vel hostia) in pyxide aut ostenditur in processionibus, ut fit apud Papistas, sentiunt non adesse corpus Christi. P. 760 : Negamus elementa illa seu visibiles species benedicti panis et vini adorari oportere.—Comp. Conf. Helv. II., Art. 21 (p. 74, Augusti). On the other side, Conc. Trid., Sess. 13, can. 4 : Denuo hoc sancta synodus declarat, per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi, et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus, quæ conversio convenienter et proprie a sancta catholica ecclesia *transubstantiatio* est appellata. Comp. Cat. Rom., II., 4, 37. *Bellarmine*, Controv. de Sacram. Euch., iii., 18–24.

[2] It was not only the theology of the reformers, but also the common sense of the people, which opposed *the sacrifice of the mass*, as well as the adoration of images. At least in Switzerland these two points were closely connected with each other. Thus at the second disputation of Zurich (Zinglii Opera. ed., Schulthess, i., p. 459 ss.). Among the many works either for or against the mass, compare *e. g.* the following : Ob die Mess ein Opffer sey, beyder parteyen Predicanten zu Basel antwurt uff erforschung eins Ersamen radts eingelegt, 1527. (The Reformed Church was led by Œcolampadius.)—"*No part of the Roman Catholic doctrine has met with more violent opposition on the part of the Reformers, than the mass, which is rejected in the symbolical writings of the Lutherans as well as the Reformed Church, not only in strong terms, but even with expressions of abhorrence.*" *Winer*, p. 148. To the mass as such, Luther and his followers did not object. "The nearer," said *Luther*, "our masses are to the first mass of Christ, the better they will be ; the greater the distance between them, the more pernicious they are." (Sermon von dem N. Test., 1520.) We meet with similar language in the symbolical writings of the Lutheran Church, *e. g.* the Confess. Aug. p. 23 : Falso accusantur ecclesiæ nostræ, quod Missam aboleant; retinetur enim Missa apud nos, et summa reverentia celebratur. Servantur et usitatæ ceremoniæ fere omnes, præterquam quod latinis cantionibus admiscentur alicubi germanicæ, quæ additæ sunt ad docendum populum.—On the other hand, the *sacrifice* of the mass, and the abuses to which it gave rise, such as private masses, masses for the dead, etc., were rejected, p. 25 : Accessit opinio, quæ auxit privatas Missas in infinitum, videlicet, quod Chr. sua passione satisfecerit pro peccato originis, et instituerit Missam, in qua fieret oblatio pro quotidianis delictis, mortalibus et venialibus. Hinc manavit publica opinio, quod Missa sit opus delens peccata vivorum et mortuorum ex opere operato.... De his opinionibus nostri admonuerunt, quod dissentiant a scripturis sanctis et lædant gloriam passionis Christi. Nam passio Christi

fuit oblatio et satisfactio, non solum pro culpa originis, sed etiam pro omnibus reliquis peccatis....Jam si Missa delet peccata vivorum et mortuorum ex opere operato, contingit justificatio ex opere Missarum, non ex fide, quod Scriptura non patitur. Comp. Apol. of Conf., 250, 269. A definite distinction is made between the *sacramentum* and *sacrificium*, in Art. xiii., § 17 (p. 253): Sacramentum est ceremonia vel opus, in quo Deus nobis exhibet hoc, quod offert annexa ceremoniæ promissio, ut Baptismus est opus, non quod nos Deo offerimus, sed in quo Deus nos baptizat, videlicet minister vice Dei, et hic offert et exhibet Deus remissionem peccatorum....E contra sacrificium est ceremonia vel opus, quod nos Deo reddimus et eum honore afficiamus. (Expiatory sacrifice, and sacrifice of thanks: the latter to be brought by believers, but not ex opere operato, sed propter fidem). Art. Smalcald, p. 305: Quod Missa in papatu sit maxima et horrenda abominatio et hostiliter e diametro pugnans contra articulum primum, quæ tamen præ omnibus aliis pontificiis idololatriis summa et speciosissima fuit. Form. Conc. p. 602. *Calvin* speaks very strongly against the mass: Instit. iv. 18, 18: Certe nulla unquam validiore machina Satan incubuit ad oppugnandum expugnandumque Christi regnum. Hæc est Helena, pro qua veritatis hostes tanta hodie rabie, tanto furore, tanta atrocitate digladiantur, et vere Helena, cum qua spirituali fornicatione (quae omnium est maxime exsecrabilis,) ita se conspurcant. And so in the symbolical writings of the Reformed Church the mass is entirely rejected, nor is a distinction made between the earlier and the later mass. Heidelberger Catechism, Qu. 80....Hence the mass is in reality nothing but a denial of the one sacrifice of Christ, and an execrable idolatry. Conf. Helv., II., c. 21: Missa, qualis aliquando apud veteres fuerit, tolerabilis an intolerabilis, modo non disputamus; hoc autem libere dicimus, Missam, quæ hodie in usu est per universam romanam ecclesiam, plurimas et justissimas quidem ob caussas in ecclesiis nostris esse abrogatam.—On this subject the symbolical writings of the Roman Catholic Church express themselves as follows, Conc. Trid. Sess. 22, can. 1: Si quis dixerit, in Missa non offeri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium, aut quod offerri non sit aliud, quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari; anathema sit.... Can. 3: Si quis dixerit, Missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium, veli sol prodesse sumenti, neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere: anathema sit. Bellarmine Controv. de Euch. lib. 5 and 6, the principal passages of which are quoted by *Winer*, p. 148.—In the Confess. Orthod. of the Greek Church, also, p. 165, the Eucharist is called *ἀναίμακτος θυσία*. For further statements, see *Winer*, p. 149.—The fuller development of the arguments advanced by Roman Catholic theologians, especially Bellarmine, in support of the idea of a sacrifice, will be found in *Marheineke*, Symbolik iii. p. 351, ss. Particularly remarkable are the exegetical arguments, *e. g.*, that derived from the phrase: Hoc *facite* in memoriam meam, where they maintain that facere is sometimes used in the sense of sacrificing, analogous to the Hebrew word עָשָׂה (Exod. xxix. 41; Numb. xv. 3; Ps. lvi. 15); or that derived from the history of Melchisedec, where they assign to the word הוֹצִיא the meaning of

sacrificing, because it is translated ἐξήνεγκε (obtulit) by the LXX. Marheineke l. c. pp. 377, 378.

[3] Confession of Augsb. p. 21: Apology of Conf. p. 233; Art. of Smalcald, p. 330; Formula Concordiæ, p. 602. Conf. Helv. II. c. 21: Improbamus illos, qui alteram speciem, poculam inquam Domini, fidelibus subtraxerunt. Graviter enim peccant contra institutionem Domini. Confess. Anglic. p. 94. Conf. Scotica, Art. 22. Declaratio Thorunens. p. 64. Consensus Repet. Fidei veræ Lutheran. (ed. Henke) p. 53.

[4] *Carlstadt* thought the words used by our Saviour at the institution of the Eucharist were to be understood δεικτικῶς (*i. e.* that Christ in pronouncing them pointed to his body). Comp. *Walch*, vol. xv. p. 2422, ss., xx. p. 186, ss. *Gobel, M.*, an essay in the Studien und Kritiken, 1841, part 1.*

[5] *Zwingle's* first statements about the doctrine of the Lord's Supper were made in opposition to the Romish sacrifice of the mass. In the interpretation of the 18th Article (Werke, i. 257), in the year 1523, he says: "I called the eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ *a memorial of the passion of Christ*, before I heard of the name of Luther; and Luther called the body and blood of Christ a testament; both statements are correct, and come from the mouth of Christ." Comp. his letter, Wyttenb., June 15, 1523 (Opera, p. 297). But Zwingle does not recognize the element of *life-union with Christ*. This is especially marked in his treatise De Canone Missæ (Opera, iii. 114, *sq.*), written in August of the same year, where he speaks of eating the body, and drinking the blood of Christ (in the old ascetic spirit of the church): see the passages in *Ebrard*, ii. 107. In a sermon delivered at Berne, in 1528, he speaks of being fed with the body of Christ for the resurrection (Werke, ii. 212; *Ebrard*, ii. 110). In his work entitled: Christenliche Ynleitung, 1523 (Werke, i. 563), he says, that the Eucharist is food for the soul, and a visible sign of his body and blood.—The first document of Zwingle's works, in relation to the Saxon controversy about the sacrament, is the letter addressed to Matth. Alber, in Reutlingen, in the Subsidium de Eucharistia, which forms an appendix to his Comment. de Vera et Falsa Religione, Opera, iii. p. 327 (1525), and is to be compared with his treatise: Klare Underrichtung vom Nachtmahl Christi (1526); then the treatise: Amica exegesis—*i. e.*, Expositio Eucharistiæ Negotii ad M. Luther (1527); the work, Dass diese Worte Jesu Christi "das ist myn lychnam, etc.," ewiglich den alten eynigen Sinn haben werdend, etc., and in several other controversial writings (*e. g.*, that wider des Doctor Strussen Büchlin), comp. his works, Schuler's edit. deutsche Schriften, ii. 2, and iii. Opp. Lat. iii. 1. Comp. *Ebrard*, ii. 136. The following passages may suffice as an exposition of his views.

a. In respect to the symbolical or metabolical interpretation of the words of institution: Subsidium de Eucharistia, p. 343 (referring to Exodus xii. 11): Ita igitur vox *est*, hoc loco, citra omnem parabolæ suspicionem posita

* In the opinion of *Zwingle* the views of Carlstadt were correct in the main but "he did not show himself very skillful in the interpretation of the word τοῦτο, which he evidently misunderstood," and "on the whole he was rather unhappy in his expressions." See his treatise: Ueber des Dr. Strussen Büchlin, in Schuler's edit. of his works, ii. 1, p. 479

est. ..Quis tam tardus erit, ne dicam hebas aut pertinax, ut non videat *est* h. l. positum esse pro *significat;* aut symbolum est, aut figura est....Quid nunc, quæso, causæ est, cur eundem tropum nolint quorundam mentes recipere in constitutione novæ et eternæ gratiarum actionis? cum omnia sic conveniunt, sic sibi respondeant, ut qui eis credere nolit, disperdere videatur, non ædificare velle. (It is also urged, that Christ himself was still with his disciples, and could not give them to eat, either the body that was yet to be crucified, or the body translated to heaven). Compare his response to Bugenhagen, Opera, p. 603, and Klare Underrichtung (Werke, ii. 1), p. 456: "Thereby is to consider, that the Scripture is everywhere full of figurative expressions, called in Greek *tropos*, which are to be understood or explained by something else. As when Christ says, I am the vine....ye are the branches....item John i. 29, This is the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world....John vi. 35, I am the living bread (and other like passages). Comp. his work, Dass diese Worte Jesu Christi: Dat ist myn Lychnam, etc., ewiglich den alten einigen sinn haben werdend, etc. (Werke, ii. p. 16 sq.) At the Marburg Conference he also cited the passage, John xix. 26: Woman, see, this *is* thy son!—In respect to the *μεταβολή*, Zwingle agrees entirely with the older fathers. The bread of the supper ceases to be *common* bread, and becomes holy (sacramental) by its *relation* to Christ. See his Sermon at Berne (Werke, ii. 270): "Just as a flower is more noble when it is put in the wreath of a bride, though as to its matter it be one and the same; and as one is otherwise treated who takes the signet-ring of the King, than if he had taken only so much gold, though the matter be one and the same; so here, too, the matter of the bread is the same, *but the breaking thereof and the dignity of the Lord's Supper give it such value, that it is not like other bread.*"

b. In respect to the efficacy of the sacrament: Subsidium, p. 332: *Fide* constat salus, non *corporali manducatione*, neque ea fide, qua te fingas credere quidquid finxeris, sed qua fidis *filio Dei pro te in cruce impenso.* Klare Underrichtung, p. 441: Christ means by "eating his flesh and blood," nothing more than *trust in him, who has given his flesh and blood for our life.* "To trust in him is salvation, but to eat, see, touch him, is not." Ueber des Dr. Strussen Büchlin (Werke, ii. 1, p. 481): "Our controversy is not chiefly about the question, whether the body of Christ *is in the sacrament*, but, *whether it is therein eaten bodily*; although it is not there, nor can be according to God's word." (On the doctrine of the body of Christ in heaven, in relation to this matter, see in the Christology below.) Zwingle speaks of a presence of the body of Christ to *faith*, in his Fidei Ratio ad Carol. Imp.: Credo, quod in sacra eucharistiæ h. e. gratiarum actionis cœna, *verum Christi corpus adsit fidei contemplatione*.....Sed quod Christi corpus per essentiam et realiter h. e. corpus ipsum naturale in cœna, aut adsit aut ore dentibusque nostris manducetur, quemadmodum Papistæ et quidam, qui ad ollas Ægyptiacas respectant, perhibent, id vero non tantum negamus, sed errorem esse, qui verbo Dei adversatur, constanter adseveramus.—It must be admitted that his works contain but few passages of so positive a character, because the principal task of his life was rather to oppose the false and erroneous notions of his age: but that great reformer and martyr has too often been

charged with that cold sobriety which is more befitting only a critic. "*The question, what is the Lord's Supper in relation to the subjective life and faith of each individual, was foreign to Zwingle's thoughts: he only had in view the relation which the sacrament in the church as a whole has to the death of Christ.*" *Ebrard*, ii. 155.

[6] The interpretation adopted by *Œcolampadius*, it is usually claimed, differed only grammatically from that of Zwingle. He retained the literal meaning of ἐστί, but took the predicate τὸ σῶμά μου in a figurative sense. But this difference vanishes, when it is remembered, that Zwingle was also willing instead of *significat*, to say, *est symbolum*. See note 5, and *Ebrard*, ii. 152. Œcolampadius first unfolded his views in his treatise: De Verborum Domini: Hoc est corpus meum, juxta vetustissimos Auctores Expositione Liber, 1525, (see *Herzog*, Leben Oekolamp. i. 322 sq.; *Ebrard*, iii. 162; *Dieckhoff*, 514 sq.), in which he avoids direct opposition to Luther,* and chiefly contends against the mediæval scholasticism, starting with Peter the Lombard, and making use of Augustine's definition of a sacrament. The work is full of subtle remarks on the tropical element in the Bible.—*John Brenz*, *Erhard Schnepf* and others opposed his views in the Syngramma Suevicum, (see *Hartman* und *Jaeger*, Joh. Brentz, Hamburg, 1842, i. 141 sq.; *Ebrard*, ii. 168 sq.), in which special emphasis was laid upon the *Word*, which was said to be joined with the bread in a wonderful manner; and it was thence inferred that there was a real (bodily?) participation of the body of Christ. On the interpretation of the Syngramma, however, older and more recent divines are divided; see *Dieckhoff*, 570, 582, 619; and *Keim*, Die Stellung der Schwäbischen Kirche zur Zwinglisch-lutherischen Spaltung (in Zeller's Theol. Jahrb., 1854). In reply Œcolampadius published his Antisyngramma (De Dignitate Eucharistiæ, sermones duo. 1526.) He further engaged in a controversy with Pirkheimer, Billican, and Luther himself. Compare also his important dialogue: Quid de eucharistia veteres tum Græci, tum Latini senserint, Dialogus, in quo Epistolæ Philippi Melanchthonis et J. Œcolampadii insertæ, auctore Joan. Œcolampadio, 1530, 8.

[7] On the earlier struggles of *Luther*, in which he was tempted to adopt the symbolical interpretation, see his letter to the Christians of Strasburg (quoted by *De Wette*, ii. p. 577). The first of Luther's writings in which he enters more fully into the question of the significance of the Lord's Supper is his Sermon von dem hochwürdigen Sacrament, 1519, on which see *Dieckhoff*, p. 195 sq. *Kahnis* finds in it "*a mystic bridge* (*?*) *between the mediæval and the reformed views of Luther.*" He here says "Hence to partake of this sacrament in bread and wine only means to participate in a *certain sign* of this fellowship and incorporation with Christ and all believers." Here, too, faith is expressly demanded, if the Supper is to be of any avail. But in his treatise: Vom Anbeten des Sacraments, an die böhmischen Brüder, 1523 (Walch, xix. p. 1593), he refuted not only the doctrines

* On the other hand he does not generally spare the views of the opponents: Barbaries plusquam Scythica vel Diomedea est in panis *involucro* ceu in *œnigmate* ipsam hospitis canem quærere. Rusticitas est et stupor, non observere nec agnoscere, in quo hospes benevolentiam suam doceat, et pro spirituali carnalem requirere cœnam.

of transubstantiation, and of the sacrifice of the mass, but also the theory of a mere symbol, as well as that of a purely spiritual participation. Comp. *Gieseler*, iv., p. 406. After the two last theories had found many supporters among the adherents of the Reformation, Luther zealously opposed (at first in letters addressed to several persons, *e. g.* Reutlinger, quoted by *De Wette*, iii. p. 70), those "who will now teach us, that in the sacrament of the altar there is nothing but bread and wine, and not the very body and blood of Christ," and directed attention to the differences obtaining among them as to the interpretation of the words of our Saviour. Afterwards he combated the "Sacramentarians, enthusiasts," etc., in his "Sermon von dem Sacrament des Leibs und Bluts Christi" (published towards the close of the year 1526), and in his treatise "Dass die Worte Christi: das ist mein Leib, etc., noch fest stehen, etc.," and above all in his "Grosses Bekenntniss," published 1528 (all these works are in *Walch*, xx.). Luther rested his theory, first on the literal interpretation of the words of our Saviour, which, in his opinion, is alone admissible:* "For we are not such fools as not to understand those words. If they are not clear, I do not know how to talk German. Am I not to comprehend what is meant, when a person puts a loaf of bread before me, and says: Take, eat, this is a loaf of bread? and again, Take, drink, this is a glass of wine? In the same manner, when Christ says: Take, eat, this is my body, every child must understand that he speaks of that which he gives to his disciples." (*Walch*, xx. p. 918.) Thus, at the Marburg colloquy, Luther wrote upon the table the words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, and insisted upon it so strongly, as to assert, that if God commanded him to eat crab-apples or manure, he would do it.† In accordance with this literal interpretation, Luther taught the *real presence of Christ's body in the bread* (consubstantiality), though he defended himself against the charge of a gross *impanation* which had been brought forward by his opponents: "We poor sinners are not so foolish as to believe, that the body of Christ exists in the bread in the same visible manner in which bread is in the basket, or wine in the goblet, as the enthusiasts would lay to our charge, in order to deride our foolishness. That the fathers, and we also, sometimes speak in this way, is simply because we believe that Christ's body is present; otherwise we are quite willing that any one should say: Christ is *in* the bread, or is *the* very bread, or is *there*, where the bread is, or as he likes. We will not quarrel about words [?], but merely insist upon keeping to the literal meaning—viz. that it is not simply bread of which we partake in the Lord's Supper, but the body of Christ. (*Walch*, l. c., p. 1012.)—In the same place he adverts to the fact, that God has other means by which he can enable one thing to be in another than those commonly known to us, such as wine being in the barrel, bread in the basket, money in the pocket. Thus Levi was in the loins of Abraham (Hebr. vii. 5); heaven and earth may be in man's eye, etc. Comp. his "Grosses Bekenntniss," p. 1186. A thing may be present

* In his letter addressed to the Christians of Strasburg, referred to above, he said: "The language is too forcible to be deprived of its obvious meaning by mere reasoning."

† He tries to make the tropical interpretation ridiculous, in a very plump fashion, in his treatise, Dass diese Worte....noch fest stehen (Walch, xx. 590): *e. g.* what he says of the cuckoo and ground sparrow.

localiter (circumscriptive), definitive, repletive. But Christ is always present in the bread in a way that is above reason, and which can only be perceived by faith: "How it takes place, thou canst not know, but thy heart perceives him, and by faith thou art convinced of his presence." (Walch, xx., p. 922, and many other passages.) And yet at the Marburg Colloquy he said, that the body was in the bread, as the sword in the sheath, etc. And in the Cassel Declaration, he even says, in so many words: "This is sure in our opinion, that the body of Christ is really eaten in and with the bread: so that all which the bread does and suffers, the body of Christ does and suffers, so that it is divided, eaten, bitten with the teeth, propter unionem sacramentalem" (*Planck*, iii. 368; *Ebrard*, ii. 365). Compare, however, the Formula Concordiæ, cited below.

[8] On the colloquium of Marburg, comp. *L. J. K. Schmitt*, das Religionsgespräch zu Marburg, 1829, and *Gieseler*, Church History, iv. p. 133, where the literature and the documents are given. *Ebrard*, p. 286 sq. Die 15 Marb. Artikel nach dem Original veröffentlicht, von *H. Hoppe*, Marb., 1848. (Zeitschrift f. d. Hist. Theologie, 1848.)

[9] Luther was led, logically, to the theory of the ubiquity of Christ's body, which, however, he did not propound till a later period of his life. Comp. *Rettberg*, Occam und Luther (in Studien und Kritiken, 1839, part 1). The idea of ubiquity, however, was for a long time a fluctuating one. If the body of Christ was everywhere, it was in all bread; and so nothing was proved for the specific ubiquity in the Lord's Supper. Hence, theologians were afterwards led to make more exact definitions. See *Ebrard*, ii. 698, *sq.*, and the Christology, below. *Calixt* called the ubiquity controversy, infaustum certamen; but was on this account called a heretic by the orthodox theologians; see *Gass*, p. 65.

[10] Conf. Augsb., p. 12: De cœna Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint et distribuantur vescentibus in cœna Domini, et improbant secus docentes. Comp. Apol. of Conf. p. 157. Art. Smalcald p. 330: De sacramento altaris sentimus, panem et vinum in cœna esse verum corpus et sanguinem Christi, *et non tantum dari et sumi a piis, sed etiam ab impiis christianis*.—Cat. Maj. p. 553: Quid est itaque sacramentum altaris? Est verum corpus et sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi *in* et *sub* pane et vino per verbum Christi nobis christianis ad manducandum et bibendum institutum et mandatum.—Form. Conc. p. 599: Credimus, quod in cœna Domini corpus et sanguis Christi vere et substantialiter sint præsentia, et quod una cum pane et vino vere distribuantur atque sumantur. Credimus, verba testamenti Christi non aliter accipienda esse, *quam sicut verba ipsa ad litteram sonant*, ita, ne panis absens Christi corpus et vinum absentem Christi sanguinem significent, sed ut propter sacramentalem unionem panis et vinum vere sint corpus et sanguis Christi.—Comp. p. 736: Docent, quemadmodum in Christo duæ distinctæ et non mutatæ naturæ inseparabiliter sunt unitæ, ita in sacra cœna duas diversas substantias, panem videlicet naturalem et verum naturale corpus Christi, in instituta sacramenti administratione hic in terris simul esse præsentia. Further on its authors protest against the assertions of their opponents, p. 604: Prorsus rejicimus atque damnamus capernaiticam manducationem corporis Christi quam nobis Sacramentarii

contra suæ conscientiæ testimonium post tot nostras protestationes malitiose affingunt, ut doctrinam nostram apud auditores suos in odium adducant, quasi videlicet doceamus, corpus Christi, dentibus laniari et instar alterius cujusdam cibi in corpore humano digeri.* Credimus autem et asserimus secundum clara verba testamenti Christi *veram*, sed *supernaturalem* manducationem corporis Christi, quemadmodum etiam vere, *supernaturaliter* tamen, sanguinem Christi bibi docemus. Hæc autem humanis sensibus aut ratione nemo comprehendere potest, quare in hoc negotio, sicut et in aliis fidei articulis, intellectum nostrum in obedientiam Christi captivare oportet. Hoc enim mysterium in solo Dei verbo revelatur et sola fide comprehenditur.

[11] See above, the extracts from Zwingle and the Reformed Confessions.

[12] *Prior* to the time of Calvin, *Martin Bucer*, *Oswald Myconius*, and others, spoke of the *spiritual participation* of Christ's body, which is present in heaven, an idea with which Zwingle was by no means unfamiliar, but which is less prominently brought forward in his writings than the negative side of the question (see note 5.) Hence the Conf. Tetrapolitana (1530) admits "a true partaking of the real body and blood of Christ" in terms so definite, that it scarcely differs from the Conf. Augustana. In the first Confession of Basle (1534), in the composition of which Calvin had no share, it is also said: "But we firmly believe that *Christ himself is the food of believing souls unto everlasting life*, and that our souls, by means of true faith in the crucified Redeemer, receive *the body and blood of Christ as their meat and drink*.... Hence we confess that Christ, in his holy Supper, *is present* to all who really believe in him."—On the other hand, it is also very significantly added: "But we do not include the natural, true, and essential body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, suffered for us, and is ascended into heaven, in the bread and wine of the Lord?" etc. And the second Confession of Basle (Helv. I.) A. D. 1536, Art. 22, concedes: Cœnam mysticam esse, in qua Dom. corpus et sanguinem suum, *i. e.*, se ipsum, suis vere ad hoc offerat, ut magis magisque in illis vivat et illi in ipso: non quod pani et vino corpus Domini et sanguis vel naturaliter uniantur vel hic localiter includantur vel ulla huc carnali præsentia statuantur; sed quod panis et vinum ex institutione Domini symbola sint, quibus ab ipso Domino per ecclesiæ ministerium vera corporis et sanguinis ejus communicatio non in perituram ventris cibum, sed in æternæ vitæ alimoniam exhibeatur. The Lutheran church, moreover, does not exclude the idea of a *spiritual* reception of the body and blood of Christ; but this alone, it says, is not enough: comp. Form. Concord. 744. In particular, the Lutheran divines say that the sixth chapter of John's Gospel refers to the spiritualis manducatio, which, however, they distinguish from the sacramental (by the mouth).

[13] Calvin was in complete agreement with the earlier views on this point (much as he had at first taken offence at the prosaic interpretation of

* Luther said that the body of Christ could not be treated like a sausage, for example (*Walch*, xx. 989); in like manner at the Marburg Colloquy, that we do not eat the body of Christ like "roasted pork"—which aroused *Zwingle's* indignation: see *Ebrard*, ii. 317: "many things are so sacred, that they may not be identified, nor even contrasted, with some others."

Zwingle,* designating it as a profana sententia), but also developed them more fully; comp. Instit. iv. 17. 10, and *Henry*, i. p. 127, ss. While *Zwingle* lays principal stress upon the historical fact, and the idea of a festival of commemoration, Calvin attaches greater importance to the intimate union of believers with Christ; and he emphasizes the bodily presence, not as having entered into the bread, but as communicated from above, in a wonderful manner, by a spiritual agency, viewing it as a pledge of the resurrection of our bodies—an idea which Zwingle repels. Thus, in his opinion, the Lord's Supper is not only an act to commemorate a past event, but also the pledge and seal of something that is present and future. As bread and wine sustain our earthly body, so are we nourished and quickened by a spiritual reception of the body and blood of Christ. But further on it is said: Cogitemus primum *spirituale quiddam* esse sacramentum, quo Dom. non ventres nostros, sed animas pascere voluit. Ac Christum in eo quæramus, non nostro corpore, nec ut sensibus carnis nostræ comprehendi potest, sed sic, ut anima velut præsentem sibi datum et exhibitum agnoscat. Denique ipsum spiritualiter obtinere satis habemus. Compare with this his treatise: De Cœna, quoted by *Henry*, i. p. 261, ss., and the Conf. Fidei de Eucharistia, quam obtulerunt Farellus, Calvinus et Viretus, cui subscripserunt Bucerus et Capito, 1537, quoted by *Henry*, i. Appendix No. 5. In the earlier part of this Conf. Calvin appears to express views allied to those of Luther: Vitam spiritualem, quam nobis Christus largitur, non in eo duntaxat sitam esse confitemur, quod spiritu suo nos vivificat, sed quod spiritus etiam sui virtute *carnis* suæ vivificæ nos facit participes, qua participatione in vitam æternam pascamur. Itaque cum de communione, quam cum Christo fideles habent, loquimur, *non minas carni et sanguini ejus communicare ipsos intelligimus quam spiritui, ut ita totum Christum possideant*, etc. On the other side he pronounces, in terms equally strong, in favor of the symbolical interpretation: Cæterum istis nihil repugnat, quod Dominus noster in cœlum sublatus localem corporis sui præsentiam nobis abstulit, quæ hic minime exigitur. Nam utcunque nos in hac mortalitate peregrinantes in eodem loco cum ipso non includimur et continemur, nullis tamen finibus limitata est ejus spiritus efficacia, quin vere copulare et in unum colligere possit, quæ locorum spatiis sunt disjuncta. Ergo spiritum ejus vinculum esse nostræ cum ipso participationis agnoscimus, sed ita, ut nos ille carnis et sanguinis Domini substantia vere ad immortalitatem pascat et eorum participatione vivificet. Hanc autem carnis et sanguinis sui communionem Christus *sub panis et vini symbolis* in sacrosancta sua cœna offert et exhibet omnibus, qui eam rite celebrant juxta legitimum ejus institutum.—*Bucer* and *Capito* indeed protested against the appellation *nuda et inania* symbola, as applied to the bread and wine, and denounced such usage as an error which the Church ought to reject; but had Zwingle ever made use of the expression "nuda et inania symbola?"—Thus *Calvin* (Instit. iv. 17, 32), also says: Fidem vero nos ista, quam enarravimus, corporis participatione non minus laute affluenterque

* In a letter addressed to Viret (quoted by *Schlosser*, Peter Martyr, p. 451, note.) On the question whether Calvin, as Planck supposes, held at first the opinion of Luther, but abandoned it afterwards, see *Bretschneider* in Reformations-Almanach iii., p. 81, and *Henry*, i., p. 262.

pascimus, quam qui ipsum Christum e cœlo detrahunt. Ingenue interea confiteor, *mixturam* carnis Christi cum anima nostra vel *transfusionem*, qualis ab ipsis docetur, me repudiare, quia nobis sufficit, Christum e carnis suæ substantia vitam in animas nostras spirare, imo *propriam in nobis vitam diffundere*, quamvis in nos *non ingrediatur ipsa Christi caro.* Comp. also § 10: Nos vero talem Christi præsentiam in cœna statuere oportet, quæ *nec panis elementa ipsum affigat*, nec in panem includat, nec ullo modo circumscribat, etc.... Cæterum his absurditatibus sublatis, quicquid ad exprimendam veram substantialemque corporis et sanguinis Domini communicationem, quæ sub sacris cœnæ symbolis fidelibus exhibetur, facere potest, libenter recipio: *atque ut non imaginatione duntaxat aut mentis intelligentia* percipere, sed ut *re ipsa* frui in alimentum vitæ æternæ intelligantur. Against the Hamburg preacher, *Westphal* (1552), Calvin defended himself in the most definite way from the charge of holding to a merely *spiritual* presence; but he also equally denied a *local* presence of Christ's body, and limited his statements to a dynamical. Defensio II. p. 68–72: Ita Christum corpore absentem doceo nihilominus non tantum divina sua virtute, quæ ubique diffusa est, nobis adesse, sed etiam facere, ut nobis vivifica sit sua caro.... Reclamat hic Westphalus, me *spiritus præsentiam* opponere *carnis præsentiæ;* sed quatenus id faciam, ex eodem loco clare patere malevolentia excæcatus non inspicit. Neque enim simpliciter *spiritu suo* Christus in nobis habitare trado, sed ita nos ad se attollere, ut *vivificam carnis suæ vigorem in nos transfundat.*

Slightly as Zwingle and Calvin differed respecting the Lord's Supper, the divines at Zurich at first looked with some mistrust upon the theory of the latter (*Lavater*, Histor. Sacram. p. 98.) But the *Agreement* between the churches of Zurich and Geneva was set forth in the Consensus Tigurensis, where it is said distinctly, No. 21: Tollenda est quælibet localis præsentiæ imaginatio. Nam quum signa hic in mundo sint, oculis cernantur, palpentur manibus: Christus, quatenus homo est, non alibi quam in cœlo, nec aliter quam mente et fidei intelligentia quærendus est. Quare *perverso et impia superstitio est, ipsum sub elementis hujus mundi includere.* 22: Proinde, qui in solennibus cœnæ verbis; Hoc est corp. m. etc., præcise literalem, ut loquuntur, sensum urgent, eos tamquam præposteros interpretes repudiamus. Nam extra controversiam ponimus, figurate accipiendia esse, ut esse panis et vinum dicantur id quod significant.—Comp. also Conf. Gall. Art. 36. Helv. II. c. 21. Belgica 35. Anglica 34. Scot. 21. In some Calvinistic symbols the positive element is prominently brought forward, but something is always added in order to prevent any close approach to the Lutheran view. Thus it is said in the Catechism of Heidelberg, Qu. 76: "What do ye understand by eating the crucified body of Christ, and drink the blood which he shed on the cross? Answ. By this we understand, not only that we accept with a believing heart the sufferings and death of Christ, but *also*, that by the influence of the Holy Ghost, who dwells at the same time in Christ and in ourselves, we are so intimately united to his blessed body, that although *he be in heaven and we on earth*, we are flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone, and eternally live, and are governed by *one* spirit (as the members of our body are governed by *one* soul.")—Confess. Sigism. c. 8:...."Therefore we simply abide by the words pronounced by

Christ at the institution of this ordinance—viz. that the bread is his true body, and the wine his true blood, sacramentally, *i. e.* in the manner in which God ordained and instituted the holy sacraments of both the Old and the New Test., that they should be visible and true signs of the invisible grace communicated by them; and in the manner in which our Lord himself signifies, that *the holy Eucharist is a sign of the New Testament* (covenant), *but not a mere sign, nor an empty one*, and instituted for the commemoration of Christ's death....that thus it *might be a memorial of consolation, a memorial of gratitude, and a memorial of love.*" 9: "And inasmuch as faith is, as it were, the mouth by which we receive the crucified body of Christ, and the blood shed for us, his electoral grace holdeth with steadfastness, that this sacrament does not help *unbelievers*, or *those who do not repent*, and that they do not participate *in the true body and blood of Christ.*" For further passages see *Winer*, p. 138, ss. *Schenkel*, i. 561, *sq.* *Ebrard*, ii. 402, *sq.* The idea of an elevation of the soul to heaven is from *à Lasco*; see Ebrard, ii. 535.

[14] Formula Concordiæ, vii., p. 732: Non propter alicuius aut personam aut incredulitatem verbum Dei (quo Cœna Domini instituta est et propter quod rationem Sacramenti habet) irritum et vanum fieri potest. Quia Christus non dixit: Si credideritis aut digni fueritis, tum in Cœna sacra corpus et sanguinem meum præsentia habebitis, sed potius ait: Accipite, edite et bibite, hoc est corpus meum, etc....Verba Christi hoc volunt: Sive dignus sive indignus sis, habes hic in Cœna Christi corpus et sanguinem. Comp. 743: Quod autem non tantum pii et credentes in Christum, verum etiam indigni, impii, hypocritæ (v. g. Judas), et hujus farinæ homines.... etiam verum corpus et verum sanguinem Christi ore in Sacramento sumant, et grande scelus indigne edendo et bibendo in corpus et sanguinem Christi admittant, id D. Paulus expresse docet, etc.

[15] By doing violence to the rules of grammar (viz. by inverting the order of subject and predicate) *Schwenkfeld* and *Krautwald* made out this sense: My body which is given for you, is the very thing which I distribute among you—viz. bread, a real food, and the efficacious means of preserving eternal life. As analogous instances they adduced: the seed *is* the Word of God; the field *is* the world; the rock *was* Christ. See Das Buch vom Christenmenschen (Werke, Bd. i. p. 898). *Schenkel*, i. 556; *Planck*, v., i., p. 90. *Schwenkfeld* also insisted upon the mystical aspect of the Lord's Supper: "From the fountain of God's love and sweetness, we eat the body of Christ and drink his blood, to strengthen the conscience, quicken the heart, and for the increase of the inner man in all the spiritual riches of God." "The bread of eternal life must be well masticated (*i. e.* thoroughly contemplated) by all who eat it. They eat it, and have eaten thereof, who have grasped this act of the New Testament and of our salvation with true faith, and who know, that they are not only redeemed by this same body of Christ which was broken for us, but that it also has other food and nourishment, and power to everlasting life." (Werke, i. 911; in *Schenkel*, ubi supra). Comp. *Erbkam's* Protest. Secten im Zeitalter der Reform., 468.

[16] Cat. Rac. qu. 334: (Cœna Domini) est Christi institutum, ut fideles ipsius panem frangant et comedant et ex calice bibant, mortis ipsius annunci-

andæ causa. Quod permanere in adventum ipsius oportet. Ib. qu. 335: (Annunciare mortem Domini) est publi ceet sacrosancte Christo gratias agere, quod is pro ineffabili sua erga nos caritate corpus suum torqueri et quodammodo frangi et sanguinem suum fundi passus sit, et hoc ipsius beneficium laudibus tollere et celebrare. Ib. qu. 337: Nonne alia causa, ob quam cœnam instituit Dom., superest? Nulla prorsus, etsi homines multas excogitarint, cum alii dicant esse sacrificium pro vivis et mortuis, alii usu ipsius se consequi peccatorum remissionem et firmare fidem sperant, et quod eis mortem Domini in mentem revocet, affirmant. Comp. *Socinus*, De Cœna Domini, p. 753, 6, where the effects commonly supposed to be produced by the sacrament are ascribed to the *word*, with which the ceremony is only externally connected.—*Ostorodt*, Underichtung, says, p. 230, that the Lord's Supper is only a ceremony, and is called a sacrament without any reason: see *Fock's* Sociniauismus, p. 573 sq. The Socinians regarded the controversy between the Lutherans and Calvinists as mere logomachy, and sharply criticised their entire forgetfulness of Christian love in strife about such a matter. They avowed their agreement with Zwingle. See *Fock*, p. 577.—Concerning the views of the Arminians, see Confess. Remonstrant, 23, 4, and *Limborch*, Theol. Christ. v. 71, 9 ss. (where he combats the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as held by orthodox Calvinists). The opinions of the Mennonites on this point will be found in *Ries*, Conf., Art. 34 (*Winer*, p. 135).

[17] Comp. § 258, note 7.

[18] [Westminster Confession, chap. xxix.: Our Lord Jesus, in the night wherein he was betrayed, instituted the sacrament of his body and blood, called the Lord's Supper, to be observed in his church, unto the end of the world; for the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of himself in his death, the sealing all benefits thereof unto true believers, their spiritual nourishment and growth in him, their further engagement in, and to all duties which they owe unto him; and to be a bond and pledge of their communion with him, and with each other, as members of his mystical body. 2. In this sacrament Christ is not offered up to his Father, nor any real sacrifice made at all for remission of sins of the quick or dead, but only a commemoration of that once offering up of himself, by himself, upon the cross, once for all, and a spiritual oblation of all possible praise unto God for the same; so that the popish sacrifice of the mass, as they call it, is most abominably injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice, the alone propitiation for all the sins of the elect. 5. The outward elements in this sacrament, duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such relation to him crucified, as that truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ; albeit, in substance and nature, they still remain truly, and only, bread and wine, as they were before. 7. Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death: the body and blood of Christ being then not corporally nor carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are, to their outward senses. 8. Although ignorant and wicked men receive

the outward elements in this sacrament, yet they receive not the thing signified thereby; but by their unworthy coming thereunto are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord to their own damnation.]

[19] Article xxviii. of XXXIX Articles. *Of the Lord's Supper.* The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves, one to another: but rather is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death; insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.—Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord, can not be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.—The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.—The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.—Article xxix. *Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.* The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather to their condemnation, do eat and drink, the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing. [The quotation from Augustine is an interpolation; the words are not found in any of the 20 MSS. of Augustine collated for the Louvain and Paris edition. See *Porson's* Letters to Travis, p. 229.]. Article xxx. *Of both kinds.*—The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people: for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.—Article xxxi. *Of the One Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.* The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.—On the general subject of the position of the English Church in respect to the doctrine, see Tracts for the Times, No. 81: The testimony of writers of the later English Church to the Doctrines of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, with an Historical Account of the Changes made in the Liturgy as the Expression of that Doctrine. *Burnet* on the Articles, pp. 402–465. *Puscy* on the Real Presence, ubi supra. *W. Goode*, Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, 2, 8vo., 1856. *John Johnson*, The Unbloody Sacrifice and Altar Unveiled, 1st ed., 1714, 2nd ed., 1724, in Oxford Library of Anglo-Catholic Divines, 2 vols., 1847. *Rev. John Patrick*, Full View of Doctrine and Practice of the Ancient Church, relating to the Eucharist, Lond., 1638, reprinted in *Gibson's* Preservative.]

The doctrinal differences of the various denominations are closely connected with their

respective modes of celebrating this ordinance. The principal difference is this, that the Roman Catholic Church persisted in withholding the cup from the laity, while all other parties, inclusive of the Greek Church, demanded that it should be restored to them. (See Note 3, and the passages quoted from their symbolical writings by *Winer*, p. 145–147.) On the usage about the host (in the Roman Catholic and Lutheran Churches, partly also in the Reformed Church), and as to the bread (in the Greek and Reformed Churches); on the breaking of the bread in the Reformed Church, and the reception with the hand instead of the mouth; on the elevation of the host; on the manner in which the congregation receive the sacrament (whether they go to the table, or remain in their seats); on the modes and formulas of distribution; on private communion, auricular or general confession, etc., comp. the works on archæology and those on liturgies. *Ebrard*, Abendmahl, ii. 794–796.—The strict Lutherans opposed the breaking of the bread, for the following, among other reasons, in the Consensus Repetitus Fidei Veræ Luth. punct. 72 (in *Henke*, p. 56): Profitemur et docemus, panis fractionem et vini effusionem in ora fidelium non fuisse factam a Christo ob repræsentationem mortis dominicæ, sed ob distributionem inter communicantes, adeoque ἀρτοκλασίαν non fuisse formalem seu essentialem ritum hujus sacramenti, sed tantum ministerialem, qui facerat ad meliorem distributionem.—It was a fundamental principle of Protestantism, that the participation in the Lord's Supper should be a *communion* shared in common: *Luther* also at first adopted this view (see his Letters, ed. *De Wette*, iv. p. 160), and sanctioned even the communion of the sick only conditionally (ibid. v., p. 227). Differences of usages were introduced into the Lutheran and Reformed Churches only at a later period.

§ 260.

INTERNAL FLUCTUATIONS AND FURTHER DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT.

Though the existing differences of opinion rendered impossible an immediate union between the various sections of the Protestant Church, there were not wanting those who, on the one hand, may be styled *Crypto-Calvinists*,[1] and, on the other, *Crypto-Lutherans*.[2] But the existence of these parties gave rise to increased efforts on the part of the orthodox theologians in either church to establish a more precise definition of their distinguishing doctrines, and to secure them against corruption and misinterpretation. The schoolmen made a three-fold distinction in the Lord's Supper—viz. between *matter*, *form*, and *end*, or *object*, which were again subdivided according to various categories.[3] The mystics, abiding by the mysterious import of the doctrine, took no part in the ecclesiastical controversies;[4] some of them even showed that each of the principal sections of the church rests on a religious idea, the living appropriation of which is, in their opinion, the principal thing in this ordinance, whatever meaning may be attached to it.[5] Among Roman Catholic writers, *Bossuet* endeavoured to defend, on philosophical grounds, the doctrine of transubstantiation and of the mass,[6] while the *Jansenists* and Roman Catholic Mystics rigidly retained the doctrine of the church. But they directed their attention not so much to dialectical arguments for the mere notion, as to the mysterious effects which this sacrament produces upon the internal man.[7]

[1] Compare above, § 215, note 7, *Ebrard*, p. 686 sq.

[2] *Marbach of Strasburg*, and *Simon Sulzer* of Basle. The latter was opposed by *H. Erzberger*. Comp. *Hagenbach*, Geschichte der Basler Confess. p. 87 ss. The very remarkable creeds of Sulzer and Erzberger are there given, Appendix C, p. 232, and Appendix B, p. 218 ss. Comp. *Hundeshagen* Conflicte, p. 147 sq.; *Ebrard*, ii. 484.

[3] The matter is (a) terrestris (the elements bread and wine); (b) cœlestis, which is subdivided into *a.* corpus et sanguis Christi, *β.* gratia divina; 2. The *form* is (a) interna (unio sacramentalis), (b) externa, which is composed of *a.* consecratio, *β.* distributio, *γ.* sumptio; 3. *Finis* (fructus) est collatio et obsignatio gratiæ divinæ. This end is subdivided into (a) finis ultimus (salus æterna); (b) intermedius, (*α*) recordatio et commemoratio mortis Christi, quæ fide peragitur, (*β*) obsignatio promissionis de remissione peccatorum et fidei confirmatio, (*γ*) insitio nostra in Christum et spiritualis nutritio ad vitam, (*δ*) dilectio mutua communicantium. See *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, pp. 314, 315. Among the Calvinistic theologians see *Heidegger*, Loci, xxv. p. 13 ss.

[4] Thus *Phil. Paracelsus*, Sagac. Lib. i, c. 5, § 10, comp. ii. 2, (quoted by *Preu*, Theol. des Paracelsus, p. 1); he there speaks rather of an internal (mystical) communion, than of a real participation of the elements. "The regenerate must be nourished by Christ, and not only obtain the art and wisdom of nature, as we gather pears from the trees, but receive wisdom from him who has sent it. Respecting Christ, it is said, we must eat his flesh, and drink his blood, that is, we must be born of him; he is the first born, but we fill up the number." Comp. *Schwenkfeld*, above.

[5] Thus *Poiret* in his treatise: Gewissensruhe. See *Hagenbach*, Vorlesungen, vol. iv., p. 326.

[6] Exposition de la Doctrine Catholique, c. 10 ss. In his opinion, there is no medium between the view of infidels who reject everything, and the orthodox doctrine of the Church. Every other view is inconsistent with itself; God has suffered the Protestants to fall into such inconsistencies, in order to facilitate their return to the Roman Catholic Church. The figurative interpretation, however, may be admitted in a certain sense (as implied in the real), p. 140: "Nevertheless the truth which the Eucharist contains in its internal aspect, does not prevent its being considered a sign of the external and tangible; but it is a sign of that sort which, so far from excluding the reality, necessarily implies it."

[7] Concerning the views of the Jansenists, comp. § 228, note 3. On the controversy respecting the Lord's Supper, between *Peter Nicole* and *Anton Arnauld*, on the one side, and *Claude*, a Calvinistic minister, on the other see *Schröckh*, vii. p. 367. Among the mystics similar opinions obtained to those of the preceding period. Thus *Francis of Sales* said, Introd. ii. 14: Hoc (sacramentum) religionis christianæ centrum est devotionis cor, pietatis anima, mysterium ineffabile, quodque divinæ charitatis abyssum in se comprehendit, ac per quod se Deus ipse realiter nobis applicans gratias et dona sua nobis magnifice communicat.—Comp. *Bonæ* Tract. Ascet. de Sacrificio Missæ (Opp. p. 177 ss.). *Fénélon*, Œuvres Spirit., i. p. 414.

As regards the other Roman Catholic Sacraments (respecting baptism, see § 270), their fundamental principles must be considered by Protestant theologians in other parts of their works on systematic theology; thus *Penance* is treated of in connection with the economy of Redemption, though some of the earlier Lutheran divines placed it after the chapters on Baptism and the Lord's Supper (*e. g. Hollaz*, p. 1141); the sacrament of *Holy Orders*, in connection with the doctrine concerning the church; that of *Matrimony* forms a part of ethics and the Canon Law, though some, *e. g. Gerhard*, still assigned to it a place in doctrinal theology (Loci Theol. Tom. xv.); and lastly, the sacraments of *Confirmation* (which has nothing in common with the Protestant rite of the same name), and of *Extreme Unction*, are only considered in a negative aspect—viz. as sacramenta spuria, see *Heidegger*, Loci xxv., c. 23 ss.

As regards *Penance*, the Roman Catholic Church retained the scholastic division into contritio (different from attritio) cordis, confessio oris and satisfactio operis, while the only distinction made by Protestants was that between contritio and fides. Comp. Concil. Trid. Sess. 14, c. 3, and in defence of the Protestant view, Conf. Aug. Art. 12: Constat autem pœnitentia proprie his duabus partibus: Altera est contritio, seu terrores incussi conscientiæ agnito peccato. Altera est fides, quæ concipitur ex evangelio seu absolutione et credit propter Christum remitti peccata, et consolatur conscientiam, et ex terroribus liberat. *Deinde sequi debent opera bona, quæ sunt fructus pœnitentiæ.* Art. Smalcald, p. 321, and the other passages quoted by *Winer*, p. 150. Respecting *Confession*, the two great sections of the Protestant Church differed in this, that the earlier Lutherans attached importance to private confession, while the Reformed were satisfied (as a general rule) with public confession. But neither of them demanded, like the Roman Catholics, a special enumeration of all sins, in consequence of which, both rejected auricular confession. Luther especially, in his treatise: De Captiv. Babyl., and in the Articles of Smalcald, expressed himself in strong terms against this *confessio carnificina*. Art. Smalcald, p. 323.: Confessio sic instituabatur, ut homines juberentur omnia sua peccata enumerare (quod factu impossibile est) hæc ingens carnificina fuit. Et si quis quorundam peccatorum oblitus esset, is eatenus absolvebatur, ut si in memoriam illa recurrerent, ea postea confiteretur, etc. As to the relation between the confessor and the person who confesses, the Roman Catholics, on account of their different views about the priesthood, entertained different opinions from the Protestants; see *Winer*, l. c., and the passages quoted by him and *J. H. Jordan*, Einige Capitel über die Beichte, Anspach, 1847. Here, too, *Zwingle* advances still further and objects to Luther, that in respect to absolution he still holds the old doctrine ["That the words of Christ," etc., *Werke*, ii. 2, p. 22.]—As regards the *satisfactio*, Protestants from the first not only rejected pilgrimages and similar observances, but also looked on prayers, fastings, and alms, in a very different light. Concerning *Fasting*, see *Winer*, p. 155. The nova obedientia which some Protestants would have substituted for the satisfactio operis, is, properly speaking, the same with fides (the second part of penance): nevertheless it is said in the Apol. Conf., p. 165: Si quis volet addere tertiam [partem], videlicet dignos fructus pœnitentiæ, h. e. mutationem totius vitæ ac morum in melius, non refragabimur.—The Protestant theologians further distinguished between, 1. Pœnitentia prima (magna); 2. Continuata (quotidiana); 3. Iterata (lapsorum); 4. Sera (quæ fit ultimus vitæ momentis.) The question whether the last kind was admissible or not, gave rise to a controversy with the Pietists (the so-called lis terministica). Comp. *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 394.—Concerning the *Sale of Indulgences* in the Roman Catholic Church, and the various modifications of the theory of Indulgences (which had their origin in the opposition made by the reformers) see *Winer*, p. 159.—Respecting the other sacraments (Confirmation, Matrimony, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders), see ibid., p. 160 ss. The difference of opinion among Protestants and Roman Catholics, as to the validity and dissolubility of Matrimony (divortium), prohibited degrees of relationship, the marriage of the clergy, the vow of chastity (in connection with monachism), resulted from differences in fundamental principles. (For the respective passages, see *Winer*, l. c.) Comp. *Klee*, Dogmengeschichte, vol. ii. [For the views of the Anglican Church, see *Burnet*, on XXXIX Articles, and *Pearson* on the Creed. *Rev. D. Macleod*, View of the Anglican Church on Confession, Lond. 1849. *Bp. Hopkins*, History of the Confessional, 1850.

Church Review, (New Haven) 1849. *R. Laurence*, Essay on Confess Penance, Absolution, reprinted, 1852. *I. R. Beard*, The Confessional, Lond., 1860 Correspondence on Auricular Confession between *Rev. E. B. Pusey*, and *Rev. R. H. Fortescue*, 1854.]

§ 261.

THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING PURGATORY.

In connection with the doctrine of the mass and its efficacy,[1] the Roman Catholic Church maintained the existence of a *Purgatory* to which the souls of all those pious persons depart, who die without having made full satisfaction for their sins, and out of which they may be delivered by means of *private masses* and *indulgences*.[2] The Protestants unanimously rejected this unscriptural doctrine,[3] and also the Greek theologians, though the latter admitted the notion of an *intermediate state* of the departed.[4] [The leading divines of the Anglican church held to the doctrine of the intermediate state, while rejecting purgatory.][5]

[1] Conc. Trid. Sess. 22, cap. 2: Non solum pro fidelium vivorum peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus, sed et pro defunctis et in Christo nondum ad plenum purgatis, rite juxta Apostolorum traditionem, offertur. Comp. c. 9, can. 3: Si quis dixerit, Missæ sacrificium.... non pro defunctis offerri debere: anathema sit.

[2] Ibid. Sess. 6, can. 30, but especially Sess. 25, Cat. Rom. i. 6, 3: Est purgatorius ignis, quo piorum animæ ad definitum tempus cruciatæ expiantur, ut eis in æternam patriam ingressus patere possit, in quam nihil coinquinatum ingreditur. Ac de hujus quidem doctrinæ veritate, quum et scripturarum testimoniis et apostolica traditione confirmatam esse sancta concilia declarant, eo diligentius et sæpius parocho disserendum erit, quod in ea tempora incidimus, quibus homines sanam doctrinam non sustinent. Comp. *Bellarmine*, De Amiss. Grat. et Statu Peccati, i. c. 14, p. 116, De Justific. v. 4. p. 1084. *Bossuet*, Exposit. 8, p. 72, made but slight mention of purgatory, and bestowed praise upon the Council of Trent on account of the great caution (*grande retenue*), with which it expressed itself concerning this point.

[3] Art. Smalcald. p. 307: Purgatorium et quidquid ei solennitatis, cultus et quæstus adhæret, mera diaboli larva est. Pugnat enim cum primo articulo, qui docet, Christum solum et non hominum opera animas liberare. *Zwingle* taught that after death there is an immediate entrance into the heavenly mansions; Fidei Expositio (Opera, p. 65): Credimus animas fidelium protinus ut ex corporibus evaserint, subvolare in cœlum, numini conjungi æternumque gaudere: comp. p. 50 (De Purgatorio).—Conf. Helv. II. c. 26: Quod quidam tradunt de igne purgatorio, fidei christianæ, "Credo remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam," purgationique plenæ per Christum et Christi sententiis adversatur. Conf. Gall. 24: Purgatorium arbitramur figmentum esse ex eadem officina profectum, unde etiam manarunt vita monastica, peregrinationes, interdicta matrimonii et usus ciborum, ceremonialis certorum dierum

observatio, confessio auricularis, indulgentiæ, ceteræque res omnis ejusmodi, quibus opinantur quidam, se gratiam et salutem mereri.

[4] Conf. Orth. p. 112 : Πῶς *πρέπει νὰ γροικοῦμεν διὰ τὸ πῦρ τὸ καθαρτήριον ; οὐδεμία γραφὴ διαλαμβάνει περὶ αὐτοῦ· νὰ εὑρίσκεται δηλαδὴ κἂν μία πρόσκαιρος κόλασις καθαρτικὴ τῶν ψυχῶν, ὕστερα ἀπὸ τον θάνατον.* For further particulars see *Winer*, pp. 157, 158.

[5] [See *Burnet*, *Pearson*, and *Browne* on Thirty-Nine Articles. Art. 22 declares : "The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping, and Adoration, as well of Images as of Reliques, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrants of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."—Doctrine of the Church on Purgatory, by *Dr. Thos. Deacon* (a non-juring bishop, died 1753), 8vo., 1718. Archd. *Blackburn*, Historical Account of Controversy about Intermediate State, 2d ed., 1772 (Works, vol. 3, 1804). Archbishop *Usher*, on Prayers for the Dead, reprinted in Tracts for the Times, No. 72.—On Purgatory, in Tracts for the Times, No. 79.]

SECOND CLASS.

DOCTRINES IN WHICH PROTESTANTS AND ROMAN CATHOLICS MORE OR LESS AGREED

(IN OPPOSITION TO THE MINOR SECTS.)

FIRST DIVISION.

THEOLOGY PROPER.

§ 262.

TRINITARIANS AND ANTITRINITARIANS.

However much Protestants differed from Roman Catholics in their general system of faith, they were in perfect accordance as to the doctrine of the *Triune God*, resting on the decisions of the ancient œcumenical councils.[1] The views of the earlier *Unitarians*, as well as of the latter *Socinians*, were directly at variance with the Trinitarian doctrine of three persons and one nature in God; and it is worthy of observation that they revived the various Antitrinitarian views of former times. *Michael Servetus* adopted the position of Sabellius, but with this difference, that (after the example of Photinus) he made a distinction between the *Son of God* who appeared in time, and the *eternal Logos* (Word).[2] Others, again, bordered upon Arianism.[3] *Faustus Socinus* returned to the (abstract) Unitarianism of the Nazarenes, or the Alogi, who, acknowledging only the Father as God, regarded Christ as a mere man, endowed with extraordinary gifts, and afterwards elevated to heaven, and the Holy Ghost as a divine energy.[4] The *Arminians* adhered on the whole, to the orthodox doctrine, but with intimations as to the subordination of both the Son and the Spirit[5] to the Father, which brought upon them the reproach of a tendency to Socinianism. [In England the subordination scheme was vindicated by *Bishop Bull*, on the basis of the consent of the early fathers; the Arian system was revived by *Samuel*

Clarke; and a tendency to Trithèism was imputed to *William Sherlock*, by *Wallis* and *South*, who, in turn, were charged with Sabellianism.][1]

[1] Insinuations were, nevertheless, thrown out against the reformers themselves, as if they countenanced Antitrinitarian errors. Thus, *Calvin* was at one time charged with Arianism by *Caroli;* see *Henry*, Leben Joh. Calvins, vol. i. p. 181. It is, however, remarkable, that the terms *Trinity* and *person* were avoided in the Confession of Geneva (*Henry*, p. 182). *Melancthon*, too, in the first edition of his Loci, pronounced the scholastic definitions respecting the nature of the Trinity foreign to Christian theology.* And *Luther* frankly confessed (Ueber die letzten Worte Davids, Wittenberg, edit. vol. v. p. 551): "It is not to be wondered at, that when a man reads this mysterious, incomprehensible article, strange thoughts should occur to him, of which one or another is sometimes little appropriate, and gives rise to dangerous expressions. Yet, the foundation of our faith remaining unshaken, such splinters, chips, and straws, will do us no harm. But the basis of the faith is our belief that there are three persons in one God, and each person is the one, perfect God; so that the three persons are not confounded, nor the divine substance divided, but the distinction of persons and unity of nature go together. This is the great mystery, which angels will never cease to contemplate and to admire, and the beholding of which constitutes their blessedness. If they could ever see the end of it, there would also be an end of their blessedness."† *Calvin* expresses himself in a more speculative way, *e. g.*, in his Institutes, i. 13, and elsewhere (against Servetus). His exposition of the Trinity, says *Gass* (p. 105) "*is undoubtedly the best, the most comprehensive and careful, which can be found in the writings of the reformers.*" The definitions of the schools, however, were not introduced into the Church Confessions of the Protestants. The Lutherans simply appealed to the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, which, together with the Apostles' Creed, were prefixed to the Liber Concordiæ. Among the symbolical books of the Reformed Church, the First Confession of Basle designates the first article (that concerning the Trinity) as a symbolum commune: der gemein Gloub. In several Confessions of Faith, the erroneous innovations of the times were rejected. Thus, in the Conf. Aug. Art. 1:.....Nomine Personæ utuntur ea significatione, qua usi sunt in hac causa scriptores ecclesiastici, ut significet non partem aut qualitatem in alio, sed quod proprie subsistit. Damnant omnes hæreses.....Samosatenos veteres et neotericos, qui cum tantum unam personam esse contendant, de Verbo et de Spiritu Sancto *astute et impie rhetoricantur*, quod non sint personæ distinctæ, sed quod Verbum significet verbum vocale et Spiritus motum in rebus creatum. In the Apol. it is said; Primum articulum Con-

* This is otherwise in the later editions: the doctrine is most fully unfolded by Melancthon in the third edition of his Loci (Corp. Reform. xxi., p. 614), but yet without any proper speculative construction.

† There are also in Luther hints about a speculative treatment of the doctrine (see *Heppe*, p. 285, *Dieckhoff*, § 214); but they have the air of reminiscences from the earlier scholastic mysticism.

fessionis nostræ *probant* nostri adversarii.... Hunc articulum semper docuimus et defendimus, et sentimus eum habere certa et firma testimonia in Scripturis Sanctis, quæ labefactari non queunt. Comp. Conf. Helvet. II., Art. 3, where, in proof of this doctrine, the following passages are quoted from Scripture—viz., Luke i. 35; Matt. iii. 16, 17; John i. 32; Matt. xviii. 19; John xiv. 26, xv. 26.* Comp. Conf. Gall. 6; Belg. 8 and 9; Angl. 1 and 2; Scotica 1. On the doctrine of the Trinity as propounded in the Catech. Heidelberg. (*God* the Father, *God* the Son, and *God* the Holy Ghost), see *Beckhaus* in Illgen, l. c. p. 52.

[2] De Trinitatis Erroribus in 7 books, extracts from which are given in *Trechsel*, Antitrinitar. p. 67–98. Servetus instead of commencing his deduction with the Logos, *i. e.*, in a speculative manner, adopted the analytico-historical mode of procedure. He treats first of the person of Christ,† *i. e.*, Christ in human manifestation. This is the *Son* of God; orthodox theologians, he says, incorrectly represent the *Word* (taken in the sense applied to it by the Apostle John) as the Son, and thus deny that the man Christ is the Son of God.—He expressed himself in decided terms against the separation of two natures. In his opinion, Christ is man filled with the divine nature, and wholly pervaded with the divine nature. He only denied that God is man, but not that Christ is God.—He regarded the Holy Spirit as a divine energy and breath in creation, and a moral principle working in man; in reference to the latter point he is called *Holy Spirit*.—But Servetus endeavored, in every way, to ridicule the ecclesiastical (post-Nicene) doctrine of the Trinity; he only admitted a triad in the sense of Sabellius: Quia tres sunt admirandæ Dei dispositiones, in quarem qualibet divinitas relucet, ex quo sanissime trinitatem intelligere posses: nam Pater est tota substantia et unus Deus, ex quo gradus isti et personatus descendunt. Et tres sunt, non aliqua rerum in Deo distinctione, sed per Dei *οἰκονομίαν* variis Deitatis formis; nam eadem divinitas, quæ est in Patre, communicatur filio Jesu Christo et spiritui nostro, qui est templum Dei viventis; sunt enim filius et sanctificatus spiritus noster consortes substantiæ Patris, membra, pignora et instrumenta, licet varia sit in iis deitatis species; et hoc est, quod distinctæ personæ dicuntur, *i. e.*, multiformes deitatis aspectus, diversæ facies et species. Servetus asserted that the term *Logos*, in the writings of John, does not denote a person, but, according to its etymology, signifies oraculum, vox, sermo, eloquium Dei. In his argumentation, he returned to the ancient distinction between *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and *προφορικός* (f. 48, quoted by *Trechsel*, p. 79): Verbum in Deo proferente est ipsemet Deus loquens. Post prolationem est ipsa caro; seu Verbum Dei, antequam caro illa fieret, intelligebatur ipsum Dei oraculum inter nubis caliginem nondum manifestatum (the hidden God), quia Deus erat ille sermo. Et postquam Verbum homo factum est, per Verbum intelligimus ipsum Christum, qui est Verbum

* It is remarkable that the well known passage, 1 John, v. 7, is nowhere quoted; Luther also omitted it in his translation.—In the first Confession of Basle no scriptural proofs were adduced, but in a marginal note it was observed: "this is proved by the whole Scripture, by many passages in both the Old and the New Testaments."

† Hence we must here anticipate somewhat, treating of the christology in connection with theology.

Dei et vox Dei; nam quasi vox est ex ore Dei prolatus. Propterea dicitur ipse Sermo Patris, quia Patris mentem enunciat et ejus cognitionem facit. In his opinion there was no interval between the (hypostatical) generation of the Son, and the birth of Christ. The prolatio verbi and the generatio carnis are *one* and *the same* act. He also rejected what were commonly called the *opera ad intra*. Comp. *Heberle:* Michael Servets Trinitätslehre und Christologie (in the Tübingen Theologische Zeitschrift, 1840, 2. The chief refutation of Servetus was by *Calvin*, in his Defensio orthod. Fidei adversus prodigiosos Errores Serveti.

[3] This was the case, *e. g.*, with *William Campanus*, who, though refusing to admit the Arian phrase, ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, nevertheless strongly asserted the subordination of the Son to the Father, and termed him "the steward and servant, the messenger and ambassador of God." But the Divinity of the Holy Spirit was especially by Campanus impugned: "Nothing in the world can be more futile, and *against* nothing can more powerful arguments be adduced from Scripture." Accordingly, he supposed the existence of *two* Divine persons alone—viz., the Father and the Son; as matrimony too admits only two persons, and excludes every third. See *Trechsel*, p. 32 (after *Schelhorn*, Dissert. de Joh. Campano Antitrinitario, in his Amœnitatt. Litt. T. xi. p. 32, ss.) *Adam Pastoris* (Rudolph Martini) also appears to have propounded Arian errors rather than Sabellian; see *Trechsel*, p. 32.

[4] *F. Socinus* agreed with Servetus in rejecting the idea of persons in the Divine nature; but he considered Christ as ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος, not, like Servetus, as a man filled and pervaded with the Divine nature, or, as it were, God appearing in the world, manifesting himself in the flesh. He differed from the Ebionites only in this, that he (like the Nazarenes) supposed the birth of Christ to be supernatural. He substituted a man who became, as it were, God, for God becoming man; for he ascribed a kind of divine worship to that Christ who *after* his resurrection, was elevated to heaven (a species of worship resembling that which Roman Catholics render to their saints, though of a higher order). Comp. Catech. Racov., p. 32: Vox *Deus* duobus potissimum modis in Scripturis usurpatur: prior est, cum designat illum, qui in cœlis et in terra omnibus ita dominatur et præest, ut neminem superiorem agnoscat, atque in hac significatione Scriptura unum esse Deum asserit. Posterior modus est, cum eum denotat, qui potestatem aliquam sublimem ab uno illo Deo habet aut deitatis unius illius Dei *aliqua ratione* particeps est. Etenim in Scripturis propterea Deus ille unus Deus deorum vocatur (Ps. l. 1.) Et hac quidem posteriore ratione filius Dei vocatur Deus in quibusdam Scripturæ locis.—That Christ was *ex essentia patris genitus*, is most strongly denied in the Catech. Racov., p. 56. Other passages are quoted by *Winer*, p. 42. (Compare below on Christology.)—Concerning the Holy Spirit, Socinus said, in his Breviss. Institt. p. 652: Quid de Spir. S. dicis? Nempe illum non esse personam aliquam a Deo, cujus est spiritus, distinctam, sed tantummodo (ut nomen ipsum Spiritus, quod flatum et afflationem, ut sic loquar, significat, docere potest) ipsius Dei vim et efficaciam quandam, *i. e.* eam, quæ secum sanctitatem aliquam afferat, etc. Comp. Bibl. Fratr. Pol. ii., p. 445, b.: Spiritum Sanctum virtutem Dei atque efficaciam, qua aliquo

modo res ab ipso Deo sanctificantur, esse credimus. Personam vero ipsum Spiritum Sanctum, proprie et in potiorem significatum acceptum, et ab ipso Deo, cujus est spiritus, distinctum esse, negamus. Sanctam motionem, creatam a Deo in anima hominis metonymice auctorem rei pro re ipsa nominando, Spiritum Sanctum appellari posse, dubitari nequit. Sed aliud est appellari posse, aliud vero re ipsa esse. According to the Socinians, the doctrine of the Trinity is equally opposed to Scripture* and to reason; they combated it on both grounds: see *Fock*, Socinianismus, p. 454 sq.

[5] The Confess. Remonstr., c. 3, was indeed silent on the subject of subordination, but *Episcopius* expressed himself as follows, Inst. Theol., 4, 2, 32, p. 33: Sed addo, certum esse ex Scripturis, personis his tribus divinitatem divinasque perfectiones tribui non collateraliter aut coordinate, sed subordinate, ita ut pater solus naturam istam divinam et perfectiones istas divinas a se habeat sive a nullo alio, filius autem et Spir. S. a patre: ac proinde pater divinitatis omnis, quæ in filio et spiritu sancto est, fons ac principium sit.—Limborch Theol. Christ., ii. 17, § 25: Colligimus, essentiam divinam et filio et spiritui sancto esse communem. Sed et non minus constat, inter tres hasce personas subordinationem esse quandam, quatenus pater naturam divinam a se habet, filius et spir. S. a patre, qui proinde divinitatis in filio et spiritu sancto fons est et principium. Communis christianorum consensus ordinis ratione prærogativam hanc agnoscit, patri semper tribuens primum locum, secundum filio, tertium spiritui sancto. Sed et est quædam supereminentia, patris respectu filii, et patris ac filii respectu spiritus sancti, ratione dignitatis ac potestatis. Dignius siquidem est generare, quam generari, spirare quam spirari, etc.

[6] [Compare above, § 234, Notes 10 and 11, p. 213. Bishop Bull's Defensio Fidei Nicen., 1680, was intended to restore the authority of the early fathers of the church, which had been abandoned by some of the orthodox. Petavius even had endeavoured to show that little dependence could be placed upon them. The Defensio is partly in opposition to him, and also to Zwicker and Sandius. Bossuet claimed that Bull held to the infallibility of the Council of Nice (Hist. de Variat., liv. xv., § 103), but without adequate grounds. Bull's Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, 1694, had more direct reference to the lax views of Episcopius and Curcellæus. His last chief work, Primitive and Apostolical Tradition, was against Zwicker who represented the divinity of Christ, and the Incarnation, as inventions of the early heretics. Bull's mode of discussion is historical rather than metaphysical. He held to a subordination of the Son in the divine essence, while opposing Tritheism, Arianism, and Sabellianism.—The controversy was carried over into the metaphysical question by *Dr. Wm. Sherlock*, in his Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, 1690, in reply to two anonymous books, viz., Brief Notes on the Creed of Athanasius, and a Brief View of the Unitarians and Socinians. Dr. Sherlock proposed an "easy and intelligible" mode of explaining the Trinity. But he was opposed as tritheistic by *Dr. Wallis*, Savilian Prof. of Geometry (in 7 Letters to a Friend, 1690–1), and by *Robert South*, Animadversions on Dr. Sherlock's book, 1693. The two latter were

* 1 John, v. 7, is not genuine, but even if so, it asserts only the agreement in testimony and not the unity of essence.

accused of Sabellianism. The parties were termed *tritheists* and *nominalists*. In this controversy Bull took no direct part, but some of the points are discussed in his posthumous work, Discourse on the Doctrine of the Catholic Church in the first three Centuries, etc., drawn up for Lord Arundell. *Cudworth's* Intellectual System, and *Stillingfleet's* Vindication of the Trinity, 1697, appeared about the same time. The latter says: "whether an infinite nature can communicate itself to three different substances without such division as is among created beings, must not be determined by bare numbers, but by the absolute properties of the Divine nature, which must be owned to be above our comprehension." *Dr. Sherlock*, besides his Vindication, also wrote a Defence of his Notice of a Trinity in Unity; the Present State of the Socinian Controversy; Distinction between Real and Nominal Trinitarians, etc. The discussion was continued between *Samuel Clarke* and *Waterland*, (see p. 213 above), turning upon the possibility of a kind of second, and inferior deity, which was maintained by Clarke, who appealed from the fathers to the Scriptures. His position was substantially that of the high Arians. Dr. Waterland replied, vindicating the eternity and consubstantiality of the Son, and exploding the distinction between absolute and relative deity. Other works called out in the progress of the discussion were, *Waterland's* Sermons at Lady Moyer's Lectures, 1720; *Whitby's* Modest Disquisition, 1715, with Waterland's replies (turning on the meaning of essence, person, personality, hypostasis); Waterland says, that Whi by here changes the state of the question: "With Bishop Bull, the question was, whether the Ante-Nicene Fathers believed the Son to be an *eternal*, *uncreated*, and strictly *divine* substance: with you (Whitby) it is, whether they believed him to be the same numerical, intellectual *essence*, (*i. e. person*), with the Father." Works of *Calamy* (Sermons on Trinity), *Glocester Ridley* (Divinity of Holy Ghost, reprinted, Oxf., 1802), *Whiston* (Council of Nice, 1713), *Thos. Randolph* (Vind. of Christ's Divinity), *Arthur Collier* (Treatise on the Logos, 1732), continued the controversy to the close of the period. Compare also, *John Howe's* Calm Discourse of the Trinity in the Godhead; and *John Owen's* reply to Sherlock, and Brief Vind. of Trinity (works, vol. x.); *Stillingfleet's* Scripture Mysteries, and Trinity and Transubstantiation compared (republ. in Bp. Randolph's Enchiridion Theologicum, vols. 2 and 3); *Berriman* on the Trinity, 1732; *Sherlock* on the Socinian Controversy, 1698; *Edwards'* Preservative against Socinianism, 1703. See *Van Mildert's* Life of Waterland.]

§ 263.

THE SYSTEMATIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING GOD, TOGETHER WITH ITS MYSTICAL AND SPECULATIVE ASPECT.

Faith in the Trinity served as a basis for the further development of theology in the Protestant Church. Among the arguments for *the existence of God*, the ontological proof was revived by *Des Cartes*.[1] Most doctrinal writers of this period, however, made

the historical fact of a divine revelation to man the starting point of their systems, and thus necessarily presupposed the metaphysical existence of God.[2] They indulged more freely in definitions respecting his attributes, adopting for the most part the scholastic method of investigation.[3] But the doctrine of the Trinity in particular was further carried out both by systematic and argumentative theologians, and by theosophic mystics. The theology of the schools, (which even went so far as to make salvation dependent upon dogmatic definitions),[4] made a distinction between the relation in which the divine persons stand to each other (opera ad intra), and the relation in which they stand to the world and to mankind (opera ad extra), which were again variously subdivided.[5] On the other hand, the mystics endeavoured to fathom the depths of the mystery, but in doing this frequently confounded theology with natural philosophy.[6]

[1] Cartesii Meditatt. de Prima Philos. in quibus Dei Existentia et Animæ humanæ a Corpore Distinctio demonstratur. Amst., 1641, 4 (1654.)—Principia Philosophiæ, Amst. 1650, 4, Lib. i. c. 14: Considerans deinde inter diversas ideas, quas apud se habet [mens], unam esse entis summe intelligentis, summe potentis et summe perfecti, quæ omnium longe præcipua est, agnoscit in ipsa existentiam non possibilem et contingentem tantum, quemadmodum in ideis aliarum omnium rerum, quas distincte percipit, sed omnino necessariam et æternam. Atque ut ex eo, quod, exempli causa, percipiat in idea trianguli necessario contineri, tres ejus angulos æquales esse duobus rectis, plane sibi persuadet, triangulum tres angulos habere æquales duobus rectis, ita ex eo solo, quod percipiat existentiam necessariam et æternam in entis summe perfecti idea contineri, plane concludere debet, ens summe perfectum existere. (As regards the question whether God may be comprehended, or not, Des Cartes appropriately distinguished between comprehendere Deum, and intelligere. The former is denied to us, the latter alone is permitted, l. c. c. 19.)

[2] *Melancthon* speaks of the consciousness of God implanted in man; see his Locus de Deo (Corpus Reform. xxi. p. 107), and the passages cited by *Heppe*, p. 261, *sq.* [*e. g.* in his Comm. on Romans, i. 19: Divinitas ejus et æterna potentia, *i. e.*, quod sit Deus æternus, potens, sapiens, justus, bonus, puniens injustos, exaudiens et adjuvans justos, hæc, inquam, agnoscit mens, intuens opificium mundi. In his De Anima, he says, that the works of the visible creation would not lead men to a knowledge of God, nisi prius fulgerent in mentibus nostris multæ notitiæ, distinctio unitatis et multitudinis, distinctio naturæ sapientis et bonæ. Imo etiam aliquam Dei notitiam inter has fulgere in nobis oportet, ut ad eam accommodari signa possint.] *Luther* speaks in the same way, ibid. p. 264, *sq.* [The knowledge of God, he says, in his Commentary on Romans, i. 19, is implanted in the heart of man, etc. *Calvin*, also in his Institutes, strongly asserted this implanted knowledge of deity; and this was generally held by the Reformed divines: see *Schweizer*, Glaubenslehre, i.; and *Heppe*, Dogmatik der evang.-Reform. Kirche, 1861,

p. 37, *sq.*] On the proofs of the existence of God, *Baier*, observes, p. 159: Esse Deum inter christianos supponi magis, quam probari debere, videri potest: quia tamen non solum cum Atheis, verum etiam alias ob corruptionem naturæ cum dubitationibus mentium nostrarum decertandum est· *ideo non sunt negligendi*, qui Dei existentiam probant. Most of the earlier orthodox theologians made no mention of these arguments, and it was not till after the time of Wolf, "*that they were held to be as momentous as if the existence or non-existence of God depended on them;*" *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 126. Yet still it was a part of orthodoxy to hold that the existence of God could be proved. Thus the Consensus Repetitus, Punct. 10 (in *Henke's* ed., p. 9), says against *Calixt*: Rejicimus eos, qui docent, quod sit Deus non debere a Theologo probari, sed tamquam naturaliter supponi.

[3] The divine attributes were not called *proprietates* (which have reference to the Trinity, comp. note 4), but *attributa* Dei, *i. e.* conceptus essentiales, quibus notio Dei absolvitur; these again were subdivided into quiescentia and transeuntia, etc. See Hollaz, p. 235: Attributa divina ab essentia divina et a se invicem distinguuntur non *nominaliter*, neque *realiter*, sed *formaliter*, sec. nostrum concipiendi modum, non sine certo distinctionis fundamento. Concerning the particular attributes, compare the compendiums of *De Wette*, p. 56; *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 135, ss. Among the Reformed divines, the doctrine of the divine attributes was most completely developed by *Hyperius*, and *Ursinus*; see *Heppe*, Dogmatik des deutschen Protest. i. p. 274 [also his Dogmatik d. evang.-Ref. Kirche, p. 42, *sq.*]—The Socinians (like Origen) limited the *omniscience* of God; see *Dorner* (review of *Winer's* Symbolik in the Theolog. Studien und Kritiken, 1838, part 2.)*

[4] After the manner of the Athanasian symbol, Quicunque vult salvus esse, etc., the Consensus Repetitus, punct. 11 (in *Henke*, p. 10), declares: Rejicimus eos, qui docent, quod sufficiat credere unum esse Deum, qui pater sit, et filius, et spiritus sanctus, neque ad credenda sive ad articulos fidei proprie strictoque ita dictos, *quorum videlicet ignorantia salutem excludit*, pertineant notiones divinæ, proprietates et relationes, quomodo et a se invicem et ab essentia modaliter sive alio modo distinguantur personasve constituant, etc.

[5] A. The opera ad intra (notæ internæ) constitute the character hypostaticus of each person. They are immanent, and may be divided into *a. Actus personales* (*α*) Pater generat filium et spirat Spiritum. (*β*) Filius generatur a Patre, spirat cum Patre Spir. Sanctum. (*γ*) Spir. S. procedit a Patre Filioque. *b. Proprietates personales.* (*α*) Paternatis, (*β*) Filiatio s. gene-

* How much *Luther* avoided all scholastic subtility in his definitions of the divine attributes, *e. g.*, the omnipresence of God, may be seen from the following passage, taken from his treatise: Bekenntniss vom Abendmahl (Walch, xx. 1802): "We say that God is not such an outstretched, long, broad, thick, high, deep being, but a supernatural, incomprehensible being, existing wholly in every grain of sand, and yet at the same time *in*, *above*, and *beyond*, all creatures; hence there can be no limitation, such as man fancies....Nothing is so small, but that God is still smaller; nothing so great, but that God is still greater; nothing so short, but that God is still shorter; nothing so long, but that God is still longer; nothing so broad, but that God is still broader; nothing so narrow, but that God is still narrower. Thus he is an ir comprehensible and ineffable being, above and beyond all that we may name or think."

ratio passiva. (γ) Spiratio passiva. *c. Notiones personales*, ἀγεννησία et spiratio activa. *d. Ordo subsistendi.* Pater est prima, Filius secunda et Spiritus tertia persona deitatis. B. The opera ad extra may be divided into: *a. Opera œconomica, i. e.* ea, quæ Deus facit ad reparandam generis humani salutem æternam. (*α*) Pater ablegavit Filium ad homines redimendos, et mittit Spir. Sanct. ad homines regenerandos et sanctificandos. (*β*) Filius redemit genus humanum et mittit Spir. S. (γ) Spir. S. mittitur in animos hominum, eosque participes reddit salutis per Christum partæ. *b. Opera attributiva* (communia), *i. e.* ea, quæ, quamquam sint tribus personis communia, tamen in Sc. S. plerumque adscribuntur singulis. (*α*) Pater creavit, conservat et gubernat omnia per Filium. (*β*) Filius creavit mundum, mortuos resuscitabit atque judicium extremum exercebit. (γ) Spir. S. inspiravit prophetas. Compare *De Wette*, p. 81, where an estimate is given in the light of doctrinal history; *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 173; *Heppe*, p. 292, *sq.*

[e] *J. Böhme*, Myster. Magn. vii. 6 (*Wullen*, p. 5): "When it is said of God, that he is Father, Son and Spirit, it is right well so said; but it must be explained, or else the unillumined soul will not comprehend it. The Father is the Will of the Uncaused [Ungrund], he is also from all nature, outside of all that has beginning, the producing Will; he concentrates himself in a desire for self revelation"....7: "This Desire is the determinative Power of the Will or of the Father, it is his Son, Heart and Seat, the first, eternal, beginning in the Will, and is called Son, because it takes its eternal origin in the Will, when the Will is first determined"....8: "The Will thus expresses itself in and by this self-determination as an out-breathing or a revelation; and this outgoing of the Will in expression or breathing is the Spirit of Deity, or the Third Person, as the ancient church alleges." Theosophische Fragen, ii. 2, 3 (*Wullen*, 8, 8): "The Will is a mere willing desire of love, a proceeding from itself to its susceptibility. The Will is the eternal, aboriginal Father, and the susceptibility of love is the eternal Son, which the Will generates in itself to an emotional capacity of love, and the proceeding of the willing, susceptible love is the Spirit of the divine life. And thus the eternal unity is a threefold, immeasurable life without beginning, which consists in pure willing, purpose and susceptibility in and of itself, and in an eternal proceeding from itself".... Morgenröthe im Aufgang, iii. 14 (in *Wullen*, p. 9): "The Father is all, and all power consists in the Father, he is the beginning and the end of all things, and besides him is nothing, and all that has come to be, comes from the Father; for before the beginning of creation there was nothing but God. But now thou must not think that the Son is another God than the Father, that he is outside of the Father, as when two men stand alongside one another, the one of whom does not comprehend the other. No, this is not the relation between the Father and the Son, for the Father is not an image that can be compared with anything; but the Father is the fountain of all powers, and all powers are in one another as *one* power; hence he is also called one God. If his powers were separated, he were not almighty; but now he is the independent almighty and all-powerful God." iii. 15: "The Son is the heart in the Father, the heart or the kernel in all the powers of the whole Father. From the Son

ascends the eternal, heavenly joy, springing up in all the powers of the Father, a joy which no eye hath seen," etc. iii. 28: "Just as the three elements, fire, air and water, proceed from the sun and the stars, and make the living movement and the soul of all creatures in this world; so too the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, and makes the living movement in all powers of the Father. And just as the three elements move in the depths as independent souls, although flowing forth from all the powers of the stars, and just as all the forces of the sun and the stars are in the three elements, as if these were themselves the sun and the stars; so the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, he moves in the whole Father, and is the life and soul of all the forces in the whole Father." Von dem dreifachen Leben des Menschen, vii. 22 (in *Wullen*, p. 25): "God is threefold in person, and willed to move himself in a threefold way according to the properties of each person, and no more in eternity. First the centre of the nature of the Father moved itself to the creation of angels, and then to this world. Next the nature of the Son moved itself, wherein the heart of God became man, and this will not happen again in eternity; and that it occurred was through the same one man, who is God, through many in many. Thirdly, at the end of the world the nature of the Holy Spirit will move itself, and the dead will arise. Thus the Holy Spirit will be the mover, who will put the great wonders, which occur in this world, all in the eternal essence, to the honor of God and the joy of the creature; and he will be the eternal mover of the creatures, for through him Paradise, which we had lost, becomes green again." Erste Schutzschrift wider Balth. Tilken, 406 (in *Wullen*, p. 69): "He that seizes hold upon the one living God, has hold upon the whole Trinity."

With Calixtus and his disciples there was a controversy on the question, how far the Trinity was contained in the Old Testament; see *Schmid*, Dogmatik, p. 217, *sq.* Consensus Repetitus Fidei, Punct. 13 (in *Henke*, p. 11): Rejicimus eos, qui docent, in libris Vet. Test. vestigia Trinitatis potius, quam aperta animumque convincentia dicta reperiri, seu insinuari potius, quam clare proponi Trinitatis mysterium. Proof texts; Gen. xxvi.; Psalm xxxiii. 6, etc.

§ 264.

CREATION AND PRESERVATION OF THE WORLD. PROVIDENCE AND GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD.

Theologians of all denominations agreed in the theistic conception of the divine nature, and, consequently, in supposing that God performed a real act of creation, *i. e. created the world out of nothing.*[1] The mystics, however, promoted more than ever before the pantheistic tendency.[2] The speculative systems of the age were favorable either to such pantheistic tendencies, by which God and the world were confounded, or to deistic principles, which banished the Creator from his works.[3] The results of the newly cultivated study of the natu-

ral sciences already appeared irreconcilable with the literal interpretation of the Mosaic account of the creation of the world.[4] The doctrines concerning the preservation of the world,[5] concerning providence and the government of the world,[6] propounded by earlier theologians, were more fully developed in the theological systems of the present age. *Leibnitz* elevated the Theodicy into a philosophical science.[7]

[1] The prolific and genial soul of Luther, and his fresh love of nature, led him to view the work of creation with the eye of a pious poet rather than with that of a subtile scholastic, as may be seen from many humorous and witty passages in his "Table-Talk," etc. To questions such as, What was God doing prior to the creation of the world? he replied ironically.* *Melancthon*, on the other hand, had a special Locus de Creatione in his system (edition of 1543, Corpus Reform. xxi. p. 638), in which, wholly in the sense of Luther, he points to the necessary connection between creation and preservation (see note 5).—*Calvin* had less susceptibility to nature than Luther (see *Henry*, i. 485), and hence did not view the world as much from the esthetic side. Nevertheless, comp. Inst. i. c. 14, p. 53: Interea ne pigeat in hoc pulcherrimo theatro piam oblectationem capere ex manifestis et obviis Dei operibus. Est enim hoc....etsi non præcipuum, naturæ tamen ordine primum fidei documentum, quaquaversum oculos circumferamus, omnia quæ occurrunt meminisse Dei esse opera, et simul quem in finem a Deo condita sint pia cogitatione reputare....Verum quia nunc in didactico versamur genere, ab iis supersedere nos convenit, quæ longas declamationes requirunt. Ergo, ut compendio studeam, tunc sciant lectores se vera fide apprehendisse, quid sit Deum cœli et terræ esse creatorem, si illam primum universalem regulam sequantur, ut, quas in suis creaturis Deus exhibet conspicuas virtutes, non ingrata vel incogitantia vel oblivione transeant; deinde sic ad se applicare discant, quo penitas afficiantur in suis cordibus.—In the symbolical books only a passing reference is made to the doctrine of creation, because there was no occasion for entering into controversies; the expressions there used have regard to the practical rather than the doctrinal aspects of this subject. Comp. *e. g.* the Catech. Major of Luther, Art. 1.—On the other hand, later theologians more fully developed the idea of creatio ex nihilo. They made a distinction between nihil privatum (materia inhabilis et rudis) and nihil negativum (negatio omnis entitatis), and maintained the creation out of nothing in both respects.—To the questions, whether there was any time antecedent to the creation of the world, or, whether God created *time* when he created the *world?* some replied (after the example of Augustine) mundum esse *conditum* cum tempore. Again, other theologians (of the Reformed Church), supposing the previous existence of time, fixed upon different periods as those in which God created the world; thus *Alsted* de-

* His reply to the question, Where was God prior to the creation of the world? was "in the birch-grove, cutting rods, to punish impertinent questioners." *Hase*, Gnosis, ii. p 183. Comp. his Introduction to Genesis.

cided in favor of the spring, *Heidegger* gave the preference to autumn.* *Calov.* iii. 909, adopted an intermediate view: God created non *in* tempore proprie, sed in primo instanti ac principio temporis; and *Hollaz* said, p. 359: in tempore non præexistente, sed coëxistente. Compare the passages quoted by *De Wette*, p. 61; *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 152; *Heppe*, p. 305.—Theologians (such as *Gerhard*, *Quenstedt*, *Hollaz*, *Alsted*) further distinguished between Creatio prima seu immediata (*i. e.* the creation of matter), and Creatio secunda seu mediata (*i. e.* the creation of form.)†—The real object of the creation of the world (finis ultimus) was thus defined by *Calov.* iii. 900: ut bonitas, sapientia et potentia Dei a creaturis rationabilibus celebraretur, in creaturis universis agnosceretur; the subordinate end (finis intermedius) is the happiness of the creature. Comp. Heidegger, vi. 8; *De Wette*, pp. 61, 62.‡ On the Socinian idea of creation, see *Fock*, p. 478, *sq.* "*It can scarcely be doubted, that Socinianism did not teach a creation from nothing, but rather a creation from preëxistent matter.*" De Vera Religione, ii. 4: Ideo Deus ex nihilo omnia fecisse dicitur, quia ea creavit ex materia informi, hoc est ejusmodi, quæ nec actu nec naturali aliqua potentia seu inclicatione id fuerit, quod postea ex ea fuit formatum, ita ut, nisi vis quædam infinita accessisset, nunquam quicquam ex ea fuisset exstiturum. (Proof-passages given are 2 Maccab. vii. 28, interpreted after Wisdom, xi. 18, and Hebrews, xi. 3.)

[2] *Sebastian Frank*, Paradoxa, 332, b. (in *Erbkam*, p. 356): "God alone is mover and worker of all things; all creatures do their work not actively but passively. The creature acts not, but is acted on; as God works through each, so it works; the creature only holds still, and is passive to God.... For the bird does not really sing and fly, but is besung and borne up into the air; it is *God* that *sings*, *lives*, *moves*, and *flies* in the bird. He is the essence of all essences, so that all creatures are full of him, and do and are nothing but what God tells and wills." *Jacob Böhme*, Mysterium Magnum, 1, 2 (quoted by *Wullen*, p. 4): "God is the one in relation to the creature, an *eternal nothing;* he has neither a foundation, nor a commencement, nor a place [of residence], and possesses nothing but himself. He is the will of that which has no ground, in himself he is only one; he needs no place or space; from eternity to eternity he begets himself in himself," etc.—Theosophisches Sendschreiben, 47, 4 (in *Wullen*, p. 13): "In God all essences are only one essence, an eternal unity, the one eternal good; but the eternal unity could not become manifest to himself, if there were no sundering.

* Towards the commencement of the last century, *Hogel*, a rector in Gera, actually discovered that God commenced the work of creation, Oct. 26th, towards evening. See *Hase*, Gnosis l. c.

† We are reminded of the old scholasticism by the question, whether lice, fleas, and suchlike vermin, quæ vel ex varia diversarum specierum commixtione vel ex putredine aut consimili quadam ratione hodie enascuntur—were created—in primo creationis sextiduo? *Haffenreffer* responds, that they were not on hand *actu*, but *potentia*, *i. e.* in aliis animalium speciebus et materiæ habilitate latuerunt, see *Heppe*, p. 413, note.

‡ It is evident from what has been said respecting the different opinions concerning the Trinity, that Trinitarians alone would ascribe the work of creation to all the persons, which was denied by Unitarians. But the Arminians and Mennonites also referred it to the *Father* in particular. Compare the passages quoted by Neudecker, p. 347ss.

Therefore it breathed itself out from itself in such a way, that it introduced a plurality and distinctions in its own will and in properties, and the properties in the desires, and the desires in beings."—Von der Geburt und Bezeichnung aller Wesen 16, 1, (*Wullen*, p. 21): "The creation is nothing but a manifestation of the all-essential, unfathomable God; is all that he is in his eternal never-beginning generation that also is the creation, but it is not his omnipotence and power." C. 11: "The being of beings is only one being, but in his generation he separates himself into light and darkness, joy and sorrow, good and evil, love and hatred, fire and light, and out of these two eternal beginnings, arises the third beginning—viz. the creation for his own delight, and according to his eternal desire."—Von dem dreifachen Leben des Menschen, vi. 5 (*Wullen*, p. 23): "God himself is the being of beings, we are, as it were, gods in him, through whom he manifests himself." (The same ideas are expressed in other passages.)—The same mystical pantheism pervades the (poetical) works of *Scheffler* (Angelus Silesius.) Compare the passages quoted by *Wackernagel*, Lesebuch, ii., p. 431 ss. *Hagenbach*, Vorlesungen über die Reformation, iv. p. 424.—These mystics widely differed from the pietists; see *Spener*, Theologische Bedenken, iii. 302 (edit. of *Hennicke*, p. 24): "Thus there remains such an infinite distinction between God and the creature,* that both beings are not *one* being, though they are most intimately connected with each other."

[3] Thus the theory of *Leibnitz*, his doctrine of monads, and preestablished harmony, was opposed to the scriptural (and ecclesiastical) doctrine of creation, inasmuch as by the assumption of the existence of atoms (Entelechien) the Creator was thrown too much into the shade; on the other hand, the pantheism of *Spinoza* (all-God and akosmic) virtually destroyed the idea of *creation* (*i. e.* in the sense of Scripture and the church.)

[4] Concerning the Pre-adamite controversy, see § 248, note 1.

[5] The preservation of the world was understood as a Creatio continua, perennis.—*Melancthon* (in Loc. de Creatione): Infirmitas humana, etiamsi cogitat Deum esse conditorem, tamen postea imaginatur, ut faber discedit a navi exstructa, et relinquit eam nautis, ita Deum discedere a suo opere, et relinqui creaturas tantum propriæ gubernationi.... Adversus has dubitationes confirmandæ sunt mentes cogitatione vera articuli de creatione, ac statuendum est non solum conditas esse res a Deo, sed etiam perpetuo servari et sustentari a Deo rerum substantias. Adest Deus suæ creaturæ, sed non adest ut stoicus Deus, sed ut agens liberrimum, sustentans creaturam, et sua immensa misericordia moderans, dans bona, adjuvans aut impediens causas secundas. So, too, *Zwingle* (Opera, iii., p. 156): Et natura, quid aliud est, quam continens perpetuaque Dei operatio rerumque omnium dispositio?

[6] In reference to the object of providence, distinctions were made between providentia generalis, specialis and specialissima; in reference to the order of nature between naturalis (ordinaria, mediata), and supernaturalis (miraculosa, immediata);† in reference to the moral actions of men between permittens, impediens, dirigens, limitans, etc. The old divines, *Hutter*, *Gerhard*,

* By creature he understands in this place the believer, and not the world.

† Concerning the idea of miracle, see *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, pp. 160, 161.

Calov, divided the providence of God, simply into the two acts of conservatio and gubernatio. To these *Quenstadt* added as the third act, the concursus Dei ad secundas causas (*Heppe*, p. 316), defining it as *the* actus, quo libertas agendi hominibus conservatur: thus in Qu. i., p. 231, concerning the actus providentiæ, quo Deus influxu generali in actiones et effectus causarum secundarum, qua tales, immediate et simul cum eis et juxta indigentiam et exigentiam uniuscujusque suaviter influit.—In the language of philosophers this system, developed by Cartesius, Malebranche, and Bayle, was termed the system of *Occasionalism*. On the doctrine of the Reformed Church as to Providence, see *Heppe*, i. 317 sq. [The distinction of the Reformed from the Lutheran doctrine is seen in *Wendelin's* statement, that God concurs with human acts, constituendo fines, et in eos dirigendo actiones causarum, etiam fines illos per se non intendentium, ibid., p. 326.]

[7] Essai de Théodicée sur la Bonté de Dieu, la Liberté de l'Homme et l'Origine du Mal. Amst. 1710, ii. parts 12mo, often republished. The system of *Optimism*.

§ 265.

ANGELS AND DEMONS (DEVILS).

Protestants as well as Roman Catholics[1] continued to rest their faith in the real existence both of angels and demons on the authority of Scripture, and to believe in the power of the devil as something which still manifests itself in the life of men.[2] In the symbolical books only a passing reference was occasionally made to these doctrines,[3] while the theologians here again adopted and carried out the definitions of the scholastics.[4] *Christian Thomasius* and *Balthasar Bekker*, combated the belief in the devil as well as that in witches; but the former only cautiously rejected the opinion that the devil still exerts a physical influence upon men,[5] while the latter, more bold and daring, represented his existence itself as very doubtful.[6]

[1] There was only this difference between Protestants and Roman Catholics, that the latter added the invocation of the angels. Comp. § 257, note 2. The Protestants did not allow this, although they believed that the angels interceded for us. Apology of Augsb. Conf., p. 311; Wirtem. Conf., p. 526 (in *Heppe*, p. 329): Angeli pro nobis sunt solliciti. Luther also believed in guardian angels, but without making it a dogma; *Heppe*, p. 330. Socinians (like the older divines) held that angels were created before the rest of creations, see *Fock*, p. 484.

[2] On Luther's diabology, which sometimes borders on a Manichean dualism, see *Schenkel*, ii. 133 sq. He even once calls the devil a "god," (Wider die Türken, in *Walch*, xx. 2661). His conflicts with him are well known, as also his bold confronting of him. Among other things he ascribes ubiquity to the devil: "He can be in a whole city, and again in a box or nut-

shell" (see his Grosse Bekenntniss von Abendmahl, in Walch, xx. 1187.)— *Melancthon* speaks of the angels in the edition of the Loci of 1535, at the end (Corp. Ref., xxi. p. 558); in the edition of 1543 in the first Appendix (de Conjugio.) *Calvin* and *Zwingle* did not trouble themselves so much with the question of Satanic agency, as Luther: see *Henry*, Leben Calvins, i., p. 488 ss. *Schenkel*, ii. 146, 156 sq.—Various rites were also observed at the exorcism, or ceremony of casting the devil out of persons to be baptized.*— The trials of witches are full proof of the belief then prevailing in the continuance of demoniacal agency. Comp. on the whole section, *Heppe*, p. 333 sq. [Hyperius speaks of angels as ignitæ naturæ....indolem quandam igneam illis inesse, Scriptura significat.]

[3] *E. g.* Comp. Helv. II., Art. 7. For further particulars, see *Neudecker*, p. 365.

[4] Compare the passages quoted by *Hase* (Hutterus Redivivus, p. 183 ss.) from the works of *Hollaz* and others. These scholastic definitions went beyond what the reformers held on the simple foundation of Scripture; thus *Calvin* asks: De tempore vel ordine quo creati fuerint (Angeli) contentionem movere nonne pervicaciæ magis quam diligentiæ est? Inst. i., c. 14. Nevertheless Heidegger, a *Calvinistic* theologian, filled 20 pages folio with his *Breviarium* de Angelis! p. 279–300.

[5] In his "Erinnerungen wegen seiner küntftigen Wintervorlesungen,' 1702, quoted by *Schröck*, Allgemeine Biographie, v. p. 349. He denied that the devil has horns, paws and claws, or at all corresponds to the ordinary representations of him. Nor did he admit that the doctrine concerning the devil is the corner stone of Christianity, which being removed, the whole edifice must fall.

[6] *Bekker*, in his work, Die bezauberte Welte, by combating the belief of the age in witches, etc., was led to inquire into the manner in which the Scriptural accounts of apparitions of angels, as well as of the influences exerted by the devil upon man, are to be understood. Though he frequently explained away by arbitrary exegesis what did not agree with his own opinions, he correctly exposed in other places the false consequences which the advocates of a subtle scholasticism, no less than of vulgar superstition, inferred from the misinterpretation of certain passages. He endeavoured in particular to show that Scripture, so far from establishing a *doctrine* concerning angels and devils, speaks of them only occasionally, without fully enlightening us on their nature, as little as it gives complete information respecting the Crethi and Plethi, the Urim and Thummim. See Book ii., c. 8, § 2. "God did not intend to instruct us concerning the *angels*, but concerning *ourselves*" (§ 8). This is the case also with the demons: "Neither the Saviour, nor his apostles, inform us, *how* the devils fell, but at most, *that* they fell....this we should consider sufficient" (c. 9, § 1). "And as regards *natural things* [metaphysics], Scripture is not designed to teach us how they are in themselves, but it commands us to contemplate them for the

* *Bekker* also observes (Die bezauberte Welt, p. 112), that the opinions of the *Lutherans* concerning the devil resemble the views of the Papists much more than those of the Calvinists.

glory of God, and the salvation of man" (c. 10, § 15.)—In reference to the *angels*, the final result of his inquiries is, that they are real beings, and that God employs them in his service; but they exert no direct influence upon the soul and body of man (c. 15, § 9). He rejects the existence of guardian angels (c. 16.)—Respecting the *devil* many things are not to be understood literally, but figuratively, *e. g.* the history of our Lord's temptation (Matt. iv.), which he explains as "an interchange of dangerous thoughts." (c. 21, § 17.) But there are also other passages which do not support the common theory. In ch. 26, he discusses the difference between Satan and his associates; in ch. 27, he explains the demoniacal possessions as diseases which "affected the brain," and in which the disease itself was confounded with the devil; in support of his view he was of course led to suppose (ch. 28) that Jesus "accommodated himself to the prejudices of the people."—What else Scripture tells us concerning the devil, "*may easily be referred to wicked men*" (ch. 31.) This much at least is to him evident, "that the devil is of less consequence than people generally believe" (c. 32, § 1.) "*Let man examine his conscience, and there he will find the true beginning, the fountain and source of all his troubles and miseries*" (ch. 36, § 18). He admonishes men to fear God instead of fearing the devil, and thinks that by lowering the power of the devil he "the more elevates the wisdom and might of the Saviour." (§ 22.)

SECOND DIVISION.

CHRISTOLOGY AND SOTERIOLOGY.

(INCLUDING THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING BAPTISM AND THE ESCHATOLOGY.)

§ 266.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

A. H. Weisse, Die Christologie Luther's, Lpz., 1852. 2te Aufl., 1855. *Schneckenburger*, Die orthodoxe Lehre vom doppelten Stande Christi, nach lutherischer und reformirter Fassung, Pforzheim, 1848; comp. Zeller's Jahrbücher, 1844. [*J. A. Dorner*, History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ. Transl. by *Dr. W. Simon*, vol. i., Edinb. 1861.]

Not merely the doctrine of the Trinity, as we have already seen, but also that of the two natures of Christ, remained unaffected by the contests between Protestants and Roman Catholics.[1] In reference to the *Communicatio idiomatum* and the *Unio personalis*, however, a deep rooted difference of opinion arose between Lutherans and Calvinists, in connection with the controversy concerning the sacraments. And here old reminiscences about the strife between Nestorianism and Eutychianism were revived;[2] while among the sects various notions respecting the person of Christ made their appearance. Thus *Caspar Schwenkfeld* revived the doctrine, condemned as Eutychian, concerning the "*glorified and deified flesh*" of Christ.[3] *Melchior Hofmann* and *Menno Simonis*, as well as other Anabaptists, supposed (like the Valentinians in the first period), that our Lord's birth was a mere phantom.[4] *Michael Servetus* maintained that Christ was a mere man, filled with the divine nature, and rejected all further distinctions between his two natures as unscriptural and founded upon scholastic definitions alone.[5] *Faustus Socinus* went so far as to return in full to the view entertained by the Ebionites and Nazarenes, since, in his opinion, Jesus of Nazareth was by nature, notwithstanding his supernatural birth, a mere man, on whom God bestowed extraordinary revelations, and elevated him to heaven after his death, and to whom he committed the government of the church founded by him.[6] The mystics in general and the

Quakers in particular, attached less importance to the *historical* Christ, than to the manifestation of Christ *in* us, though they were far from denying the former; several of them even espoused various Gnostic theories concerning his humanity and incarnation.[7]

[1] It is well known how firmly *Luther* clung to the doctrine of the divinity and incarnation of Christ: "He whom the universe could not contain, lies in Mary's lap," etc. Compare his Auslegung des Evangeliums am heiligen Christfest (*Walch*, T. 11, p. 171. 76.) See *Dorner*, pp. 192, 193. He even uses such expressions as these, Mary *nursed God*, *cradled God*, *made pap for God:* see *Schenkel*, i. 316 (reference to *Walch*, xx. 1191, where however, the passage is not verbally the same). So, too, he did not scruple to say, God suffered, God died. Comp. his Letters (*De Wette*), vi. 291, (to Gross of Mitweida): Vera ecclesia credit, non tantum humanam naturam, sed etiam divinam seu *verum Deum* pro nobis passum esse et mortuum. Et quamquam mori sit alienum a natura Dei, tamen quia natura divina sic induit naturam humanam, ut inseparabiliter conjunctæ sint hæ duæ naturæ, ita ut Christus sit una persona Deus et homo, ut quidquid accidat Deo et homini, ideo fit, ut hæ duæ naturæ in Christo sua idiomata inter se communicent, h. e. quod unius naturæ proprium communicatur quoque alteri propter inseparabilem cohœrentiam, ut nasci, pati, mori, etc. sunt humanæ naturæ idiomata seu proprietates, quarum divina natura quoque fit particeps propter inseparabilem illam et tantum fide comprehensibilem conjunctionem. Itaque non tantum homo, sed etiam *Deus concipitur*, *nascitur* ex Maria Virgine, patitur, moritur.* *Zwingle* expresses himself more soberly and scripturally when he says that Christ "was born without sin of the pure Virgin Mary," and that he was "both true man and true God." In Christ alone he found redemption, the beginning and end of all salvation; see his Uslegung des 5 Artikels (Works i. p. 187).—For *Calvin's* views respecting the person of Christ see his Instit., Lib. ii., c. 12 ss., especially c. 14 (§ 5 is directed against Servetus). The authors of the symbolical books adopted the definitions of the œcumenical symbols: Conf. Aug., p. 10: [Item docent quod verbum, hoc est, Filius Dei, assumpserit humanam naturam in utero beatæ Mariæ virginis, ut sint duæ naturæ, divina et humana, in unitate personæ inseperabiliter conjunctæ, unus Christus, vere Deus, ut vere homo, natus ex virgine Maria.....] Apolog. p. 50, Art. Smalc., p. 303. [Filius ita factus est homo, ut a Spiritu Sancto sine virili opere conciperetur, et ex Maria pura, sancta, semper virgine nasceretur.] Catech. Major, p. 493, ss. Form. Concord., Art. 8. De persona Christi, p. 605, ss.—Conf. Bas. I., Art. 4. Helv. II., Art. 11. Belg. 19. Gal. 14, Angl. 2. Conf. Remonstr., 8. 3, etc. With this agree Catech. Roman. i. 3, 8, iv. 5, ss., and the symbols of the Greek Church.

[2] Concerning the connection between the said difference and the controversy respecting the sacraments, see *Dorner*, 1st ed., p. 166; *Schenkel*, i. 223; *Ebrard*, ii. 635; *Schneckenburger*, 31 sq.; it was not merely accidental. The difference consisted in this, that the Calvinists tenaciously re-

* The passage adduced in proof from Romans i., has not *God* (absolutely) for its subject, but the *Son of God*.

tained the doctrine of two natures in *one* person, and therefore confined the human nature of the Redeemer to heaven (*i. e.* as his present abode), while the Lutherans supposed (on the basis of the περιχώρησις of John Damascenus) a real communication of one nature to the other, on which they rested their belief in the ubiquity of Christ's body. "Where you put God," says *Luther*, "there you must put the humanity (of Christ): they can not be sundered and riven; it is *one* person, and the humanity is not to be separated, as master Jack draws off his coat and lays it aside, when he goes to bed.... The humanity is more closely united with God, than is our skin with our flesh, yea, more intimately than body and soul."—*Zwingle* in order to set aside such Scriptures as appeared favourable to this view, had recourse to what is called the *Allœosis*,* concerning which he expressed himself as follows (Exeges. Euch. Negot. Opera, iii. p. 525): Est allœosis, quantum huc attinet, desultus vel transitus ille, aut si mavis permutatio, qua de altera in Christi natura loquentes alterius vocibus utimur. Ut cum Christus ait: Caro mea vere est cibus, caro proprie est humanæ in illo naturæ, attamen per commutationem h. l. pro divina ponitur natura. Qua ratione enim filius Dei est, ea ratione est animæ cibus....Rursus cum perhibet filium familiàs a colonis trucidandum, cum filius familiàs divinitatis ejus nomen sit, pro humana tamen natura accipit; sec. enim istam mori potuit, sec. divinam minime. Cum, inquam, de altera natura prædicatur, quod alterius, id tandem est allœosis aut idiomatum communicatio aut commutatio. [The meaning of *allœosis* in this connection, is, that the identification of the two natures is only figurative and nominal.] Comp. the "Wahrhaftiges Bekenntniss der Diener der Kirche von Zurich, 1545," quoted by *Winer*, p. 68: Christ's true human body was not deified (after his ascension into heaven) together with his rational human soul, *i. e.* transformed into God, but only glorified. But this glorification did not annul the essence of the human body, it only freed it from its weakness, and rendered the body glorious, shining, and immortal.† Conf. Helv. II. 11: Non docemus, veritatem corporis Christi a clarificatione desiisse, aut deificatam adeoque sic deificatam esse, ut suas proprietates, quoad corpus et animam, deposuerit ac prorsus in naturam divinam abierit unaque duntaxat substantia esse cœperit. Comp. Conf. Gall. 15., Angl. 19 ss., Belg. 19, and other passages quoted by *Winer*, p. 69. Heidelb. Catechism, Qu. 47: "But will Christ not be with us to the end of the world, as he has promised? Answ. Christ is true man and true God. He is not now on earth according to his human nature, but his divinity, majesty, mercy, and spirit,

* Luther in his Grosses Bekenntniss (Walch, xx., p. 1180, 81), called the Allœosis, the devil's mask, and the old witch, mistress Reason, its grandmother: he then continues: "We here condem and curse the allœosis to hell itself, as the devil's own suggestion." He would prefer the term synecdochy to the word allœosis. But he will allow neither the one nor the other to militate against the theory of the ubiquity of Christ's body, p. 1185.

† In opposition to this idea of Christ's body being confined to heaven, Luther observed (Walch, xx., p. 1000), that it was a childish notion: "In the same manner we used to represent heaven to children with a golden throne in it, and Christ seated on the right hand of his Father, clothed in a surplice, and wearing a golden crown on his head, as we often see in pictures." *Zwingle* earnestly protested against this.

never forsake us. Qu. 48: But are the two natures not then separated from each other, so that the human nature is not in all places where the divine is? Answ. By no means: for, as the latter is incomprehensible and everywhere present, it follows, that though it may exist out of the human nature which it has assumed, it nevertheless exists as much in it, and remains personally united with it."

The difference between the Lutheran and the Calvinistic doctrine is expressed in the Form. Concord. p. 767: Postquam Christus non communi ratione, ut alius quispium sanctus, in cœlos ascendit, sed ut Apostolus (Eph. iv. 10) testatur, super omnes cœlos ascendit, et revera omnia implet et ubique non tantum ut Deus, verum etiam ut homo, præsens dominatur et regnat a mari ad mare, et usque ad terminos terræ, quemadmodum olim prophetæ de ipso sunt vaticinati, et apostoli (Marc. xvi. 20) testantur, quod Christus ipsis ubique cooperatus sit, et sermonem ipsorum sequentibus signis confirmaverit. The right hand of God is everywhere: Non est certus aliquis et circumscriptus in cœlo locus, sed nihil aliud est, nisi omnipotens Dei virtus, quæ cœlum et terram implet.—The unio personalis does not merely consist in this, that they (viz. the two natures of Christ) have the same appellations in common, but it is essential; p. 768: [Et ex hoc fundamento, cujus jam facta est mentio, et quod unio personalis docet, quomodo videlicet divina et humana natura in persona Christi sint unitæ, ut non modo nomina communia, sed realiter etiam et re ipsa inter se, sine omni confusione et exæquatione essentiarum, communicent, promanat etiam doctrina illa de communicatione idiomatum duarum in Christo naturarum, de quo infra aliquid amplius dicetur.] Lest they might be charged with monophysitic errors, the authors of the Form. Conc. added, p. 778: [Et quidem eis vocabulis (realis communicatio, realiter communicari) nunquam ullam physicam communicationem, vel essentialem transfusionem (qua naturæ in suis essentiis, aut essentialibus proprietatibus confunderentur) docere voluminus, ut quidam vocabula et phrases illas astute et malitiose falsa interpretatione, contra consentiam suam, pervertere non dubitarunt. . . . sed vocabula et phrases illos verbali communicationi opposuimus, cum quidam fingerent, communicationem idiomatum nihil aliud, nisi phrasin et modum quendam loquendi, hoc est, mere tantum verba, nomina, et titulos inanes esse.] Nor is the unio hypostatica merely external and mechanical: quasi duæ illæ naturæ eo modo unitæ sint, quo duo asseres conglutinantur, ut realiter, seu re ipsa et vere, nullam prorsus communicationem inter se habeant (p. 764); on the other hand the *effusio* of the divine nature into the human is not so, quasi cum vinum aqua aut oleum de uno vaso in aliud transfunditur (p. 780.) The Roman Catholics, so far from adopting the doctrine of the unio hypostatica, rejected it. Thus, *Forer*, *Gregory of Valentia*, and *Petavius*. Comp. *Cotta*, Dissert. de Christo Redemtore, in *Gerhard*, Loci Theolog. T. iv. p. 57. ["The real difference between the two is this, that the one put the substantial self of the person of Christ in the divine part of his essence, the other in the human. Hence, the one held that Christ must be, even in bodily presence, wherever he was as a divine being, and the other, that the real Christ could be only where his body was." "The Reformed maintained, that the divine properties could be attributes of the human nature only so far as the limits of the finite al-

lowed; that no nature could combine contradictory properties, could be at the same time finite and infinite. The general canon at the basis of the Reformed Christology is—finitum non est capax infiniti." *Baur*, Dogmengesch. 321–2.]

[9] Christology forms the centre of the system of *Schwenkfeld*. Among his writings, he develops his views especially in the following: Quæstiones vom Erkantnus Jesu Christi und seiner Glorien, 1561.—Von der Speyse des ewigen Lebens, 1547.—Vom Worte Gottes, dass kein ander Wort Gottes sei, eigentlich zu reden, denn der Sohn Gottes, Jesus Christus.—He defended himself against the imputation of destroying the humanity of Christ, but asserted, that Christ's human nature in its glorified state ought to be called *divine*. Accordingly in his opinion "the flesh of Christ is not that of a creature: for it is not derived from God in the same manner as God is the creator of all that is bodily, but in a higher manner; as regards other men, God creates them outside of himself, but not so Christ." On this account Christ is the *natural* Son of God (also according to his humanity); for "God not only imparted his Word to the man Christ, and united it with his flesh, but from the beginning he also bestowed upon him his own nature, being, and independence, divine treasures and riches." (Vom Fleisch Christi, p. 140–46, *Dorner*, pp. 207, 208.) "All that by which Christ is David's son, is laid aside and lost (in his divine nature); his whole nature is renewed and deified (Ibid. p. 176, *Dorner*, p. 210.) Nevertheless he rejected the idea of a twofold body of Christ, but admitted only *one* flesh—viz., the mortal flesh of Mary assumed by him: "*this mortal flesh, however, is, in his opinion, not the nature, but only the temporal form of Christ's flesh in his state of humiliation; but he does not succeed in giving us a clear idea of what he means. We shall best understand him, if we suppose, that, though the flesh of Christ has a twofold origin*—viz. *on the one hand in the divine nature, on the other in the flesh of Mary, yet it is essentially only one, inasmuch as it may be considered in a twofold aspect*—viz. *as divine and as human.*" Dorner, l. c. "*In his struggle after a clear exhibition of his views, we ought not to overlook the truly speculative element, which manifests itself in his attempt to overcome the separation of the divine and the human.*" Ibid. p. 213. Schwenkfeld formally protests (see *Erbkam*, 455) against the identification of his doctrine with that of Valentinus, Marcion, etc., or with that of the Anabaptist, Melchior Hofmann. On his (polemical) relation to *Sebastian Frank*, who taught that the seed of God is in *all* the elect from youth, and thus abolished the specific difference between Christ and other men, see ibid. p. 447. Schwenkfeld opposes both Docetism and Ebionitism: "Both errors are from one truth, as the spider sucks poison from a noble flower" (Epist. i. 292; in *Erbkam*, 448). He is most earnest in maintaining the undivided oneness of the person of Christ, which did not seem to him to be enough guarded by the orthodox doctrine of two natures. Comp. *G. L. Hahn*, Schwenckfeldii Sententia de Christi Persona et Opere exposita, Vratislav. 1847, and *Erbkam*, p. 443, *sq.* ["Schwenkfeld's idea is that of a finite nature, which, as finite, at the same time embraces the principle of the infinite. This finite is the flesh of Christ, so far forth as, in itself above

the created, it is glorified and deified;" *Baur*, p. 320. Comp. *Giesceler*, iv. § 33. *Baur's* Dreieinigkeit, iii. 219, 244.]

[4] This is referred to in the Form. Conc. p. 828: Christum carnem et sanguinem suum non e Maria virgine assumsisse, sed de cœlo attulisse. Conf. Belg. Art. 18. On *Menno Simonis*, see *Schyn.* Plen. Deduct. p. 164. At an earlier period *Melchior Hofmann* (died 1532) had propounded similar opinions. Hofmann laid great stress upon the word, ἐγένετο, in John i.: the Logos did not merely assume our nature, but he *became* flesh, hence his blasphemous expression: Maledicta sit caro Mariæ! Comp. *Trechsel*, pp. 34, 35.

[5] Comp. § 263, on the doctrine of the Trinity; and the work of *Servetus*, Christianismi Restitutio, 1553. Schlüsselburg, Catal. Haeres. Lib. xi. "*It may be said that Michael Servetus developed the idea of Schwenkfeld more harmoniously, but with some essential modifications.... Resting on a pantheistic basis, he could say, that the flesh of Christ was consubstantial with God, but the same would be true in reference to all;*" *Dorner*, p. 215. Nevertheless he did not say it in reference to all flesh: "*In his opinion Christ alone is the Son of God, nor is that name to be given to any one else.*" Ibid. He calls Christ (in distinction from all other men) naturalis filius, ex vera Dei substantia genitus, De Trinit. i. p. 13. It appears to us, that after a candid examination of his theory, more would be found in it than "*a mere divine or religious glimmer*" (Dorner, p. 216) shed upon the person of Christ, though we admit that this pantheistic Unitarianism might easily take a deistic direction (ibid. p. 217.)

[6] Cat. Racov. p. 45: Quænam sunt, quæ ad Christi personam referuntur? Id solum, quod natura sit homo verus, olim quidem, cum in terris viveret, mortalis, nunc vero immortalis. Though the authors of this Confession denied (p. 46 of the last edition) that Jesus was "purus et vulgaris homo," they asserted that *by nature* he was *mere man*, but the *only-begotten* Son of God from the moment of his birth. It was especially to Luke i. 35, that they referred in support of their opinion. This is also very distinctly stated by *Ostorodt*, Unterr. vi. 48: "We therefore believe, that the essentia or the nature of the Son of God was none other than the essentia of a man, *i. e.*, a real man, nor do we know of any other essentia or nature in him. In addition we believe that he had a different beginning from all other men, *i. e.*, that he did not receive his beginning and origin from man, but from God himself, since the Virgin Mary conceived him of the Holy Ghost, *i. e.*, by the power of God; on which account he was also to be called the Son of God. Therefore he is God's Son, even his only-begotten Son, from the beginning of his existence, inasmuch as God never had another such Son, who was conceived in the womb, and born by his own power; for the same reason he may also be termed God's real Son, because he was neither adopted, nor the son of any one else, but altogether the Son of God."—Beside his supernatural birth, the Socinians supposed particular transportations to heaven. Cat. Rac. p. 46: Qua ratione ipse Jesus ad ipsius divinæ voluntatis notitiam pervenit? Ea ratione, quod in cœlum ascenderit ibique patrem suum et eam, quam nobis annunciavit, vitam et beatitatem viderit, et ea omnia, quæ docere deberet, ab eodem patre audierit: a quo deinde e cœlo in terram dimissus,

Spir. S. immensa copia perfusus fuit, cujus afflatu cuncta, quæ a patre didicit, perlocutus est.—Here again we have an instance of that external supernaturalism which is more easily inclined to believe in *miracles* than in the great *mystery*, rather in revelations which Jesus *received* and *communicated* to men, than in the *one* manifestation of God in the flesh; rather in a man who has, as it were, become God, than in God becoming man! "*The real heart of the Socinian polemics* (*against orthodoxy*) *in all its windings, is the position of the absolute difference between the infinite and the finite God and man*:" *Fock*, p. 529, comp. the whole section, p. 510, *sq.* And yet they conceded that divine honor is due to Christ since his ascension: God committed to him power over all things. Socinianism holds fast to this notion of a delegated divinity. Racovian Catechism, 2, 120: Christus vero, etsi *Deus verus* sit, non est tamen ille ex se unus Deus, qui per se et perfectissima ratione Deus est, quum is Deus tantum sit Pater.—The invocation of Christ is allowed, but not enjoined; it is an adiaphoron, an unessential. See *Fock*, p. 536, *sq.*, 543, *sq.*

[7] *Luther* himself combined with the orthodox doctrine concerning the person of Christ, which obtained in the Roman Catholic Church, also the mystical one he derived from the work already mentioned, Die deutsche Theologie. Comp. *Dorner*, p. 193.—[Theologia Germanica, Pfeiffer's edition, transl. by *S. Winkworth*, etc., Andover, 1856.] "*All of Luther's preaching about Christ's person and work moves in the sphere of concrete representations, like nature, and handles these with such living power, always bringing before the mental vision what is actual and essential, as prevents the constraint of dogmas, and shows the poverty of mere language in exhausting the full glory of the divine acts*:" *Gass*, p. 36. Respecting the opinions of the Quakers, see *Barclay*, Apol. Thes. 13, 2, p. 288, quoted by *Winer*, p. 71.—According to *Weigel*, Christ is the Divine Spirit in man, the *Word*, the divine idea. Incarnations of this Word took place *prior to the time* of Christ; thus in the case of Adam, Abraham, etc. He also supposed (like the Quakers) two bodies of Christ. "He did not derive his flesh and blood from the mortal virgin or from Adam, but from the *eternal* virgin through the Holy Ghost, in order that we, by means of this heavenly flesh, might be made new creatures, that henceforth we might not be earthy, owing our existence to Adam, but heavenly, being created by Christ, and in such flesh possess heaven."....But this divine body was invisible, immortal. Christ, in order that he might dwell among us on earth, and do us good, assumed a visible body in the womb of the Virgin Mary; "for who could exist near the sun if it were among men upon earth?" Similar views were entertained by *Jacob Böhme* and *Poiret*. Concerning the former, see *Baur*, Gnosis, pp. 596–604, and the passages quoted by Wullen; respecting the latter, a full account is given by Dorner, p. 231, ss., note, after Poiret's Economie Divine on Système Universel, etc., v. Tom. Amsterd., 1687. According to ch. xi. of this treatise, the (ideal) Son of God assumed human nature soon *after* the creation of man, and *prior* to his fall, in such a manner that he (the Son of God) took from Adam his body, and a divine soul. Poiret also ascribed to Christ, previous to his incarnation in the Virgin Mary, not only various manifestations, but also human "emotions and sufferings," and an

unwearying intercession for mankind, his brethren (his office as high-priest). But in the Virgin Mary he assumed *mortal* flesh. "The body of Jesus Christ, assuming the flesh and blood of the blessed Virgin, is as little composed of two different bodies, as a white and shining garment, dipped in a vessel dark and full of color, and coming into contact with the matter which composes this darkness, is thereby changed into a double garment, or into two garments instead of one." (Comp. *Schwenkfeld*, note 3.)

§ 267.

FURTHER DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNAL CONTROVERSIES.

Schneckenburger, Die orthodoxe Lehre vom doppelten Stande Christi, etc., 1848. [Ibid., Vergleichende Darstellung des lutherischen und reformirten Lehrbegriffs, ed. Güder, 1855. Comp. *Schweizer*, in Theol. Jahrb., 1856, and *Gass*, in Studien und Kritiken, 1857.]

The doctrine respecting Christ's person was still further unfolded in the dogmatic systems of the Lutheran and the Reformed Church. The theologians of the Lutheran Church developed this Locus de persona Christi, by distinguishing between *three different genera of the communicatio idiomatum*,[2] which were brought into connection with the two states of Christ's exaltation and humiliation (status exaltationis et inanitionis).[3] To this they added the presentation of the *three offices of Christ*—viz. the prophetical, the priestly, and the kingly office.[4] These definitions owed their origin in part to temporary controversies within the Lutheran Church, such as the controversy between the theologians of Giessen and those of Tübingen, at the commencement of the seventeenth century, concerning the κένωσις and κρύψις of the divine attributes,[5] and the controversy carried on by *Æpinus*, in a previous century, respecting the Descensus Christi ad inferos.[6]

[1] The difference between the Lutherans and the Reformed is as follows: (*a*). The Lutherans made a distinction between incarnation and humiliation, while the Reformed kept both together in one conception. (*b*.) Consequently, according to the Lutherans, the conception and birth of the God-man is an act of his own will, he as God-man being conceived as in some way preexistent; while according to the Reformed, only the λόγος ἄσαρκος preexisted, and as such assumed humanity, and thus the God-man came to be. (*c*.) According to the Lutherans, the God-man in virtue of the *unio personalis* is received into the *Collegium Trinitatis*, and has part in all divine properties; while according to the Reformed the Logos continues to act, as a person of the Trinity, external to the divine-human personality. This had the appearance, as though the Reformed taught that there was only a *gratiosa inhabitatio* of the Logos in Christ; while the Lutherans, did not escape the accusation of Docetism. See *Schneckenburger*, ubi supra, and the next note. [In further illustration of the Reformed doctrine, compare *Olevianus*,

Fœd. Gratiæ, 38: Unio personalis duarum naturarum in Christo est assumptio non hominis sed humanæ naturæ in unitatem personæ æterni filii Dei, salvis utriusque naturæ proprietatibus, ita ut licet naturæ hæ sint diversissimæ et maneant in æternum suis proprietatibus distinctæ (quando quidem creator in æternum vult manere distinctus ab omnibus creaturis, etiam ab illa massa, quam assumpsit), tamen ita sint copulatæ, ut ambæ hæ sint unus Christus. The communicatio idiomatum (*Mastricht*, v. 4, 12) is that effect of the personal union, qua proprietates utriusque naturæ coincidunt in una eademque persona, eoque etiam de persona enuntiantur. *Keckermann*, 315: Humana Christi natura est distinctum individuum a natura divina, etsi non sit distincta persona. *Wollebius*, 66: Unionis personalis tria sunt effecta: communicatio idiomatum, excellentia naturæ humanæ; et utriusque naturæ in operibus theandricis cooperatio. Comp. *Heppe*, Dogmatik der evang. Reform. Kirche, 1861, Locus xvii.]

[2] 1. *Genus idiomaticum*, according to which *both natures* so communicate their properties to the *person* [of Christ], that itself has both. 2. *Genus apotelesmaticum*, which consists in this, that the person so communicates itself to the two natures, that certain works which belong to the whole person (such as redeeming) are conferred upon *one* nature alone, and carried out through it. 3. *Genus auchematicum* (majestaticum), mutual communication of the natures to each other by means of the communication of their properties. But inasmuch as the divine nature can neither receive anything from the human, nor suffer any loss, we can only speak of the communication of divine properties to the human nature, whence the name (from *αὔχημα*).—The Genus idiomaticum itself was subdivided into three species —viz.: a. *ἀντίδοσις* (alternatio); b. *κοινωνία τῶν θείων*; c. *ἰδιοποίησις*. (On the defects of this division, see *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 241.)

[3] The theory had its origin in the controversy mentioned note 5, and was more precisely defined by the theologians of Saxony as follows: Status exinanitionis (humiliationis) est ea Christi conditio, in qua sec. humanum naturam, in unione personali consideratam, a majestatis divinæ perpetuo usu abstinuit atque obedientiam usque ad mortem præstitit. Status exaltationis, quo Christus sec. humanum naturam, depositis infirmitatibus carnis, plenarium divinæ majestatis usum obtinuit. See also passages from *Gerhard*, in *Gass*, p. 276, *sq.* [*Gerhard*, Tom. iii. p. 562–569: Exinanitio, quam apostolus Christo secundum humanam naturam tribuit, non est omnimodo carentia vel absentia divinæ potentiæ....sed retractio usus et intermissio, qua Christus homo in forma servili constitutus et infirmitate tectus, divinam potentiam, gloriam et majestatem vere et realiter sibi communicatam non semper exseruit, sed retraxit et retinuit, donec tempus exaltationis sequeretur. Comp. *Schneckenburger*, Zur kirchlichen Christologie, p. 3.]—The theologians of the Reformed Church simply referred the two states to the two natures. According to the Lutherans, the birth of Christ, his circumcision, his subjection to his parents, his intercourse with men who were unworthy of it, his sufferings, death, and burial, belong to the state of humiliation; the Descensus ad inferos (Art. 9 in the Form. Concord. directed against *Æpinus* and the Calvinists, see note 6), his resurrection from the dead, his ascension into heaven, and sitting down at the right hand of God, belong to the state

of exaltation.—On the contrary, the Calvinists, denying that Christ actually descended to hell, and interpreting the passages bearing upon this point of his mental sufferings and dreadful anguish, or as an equivalent for his real death, maintained that the Descensus ad inferos belongs to the status exinanitionis. See *Schneckenburger*, ubi supra, second division.

[4] The Munus propheticum has reference to Christ's office as a teacher and messenger sent by God to reveal his will; the Munus sacerdotale has respect to his atoning death (comp. the next §), and priestly intercession (satisfactio et intercessio); the object of the Munus regium is, in the first instance, the foundation and government of the church; but it also includes the government of the world; on which account a distinction was made between a kingdom of power and a kingdom of grace (the heavenly kingdom). *Gerhard:* Regnum potentiæ est generale dominium super omnia, videlicet gubernatio cœli et terræ, subjectio omnium creaturarum, dominium in medio inimicorum, quos reprimit, coërcet et punit. Regnum gratiæ est specialis operatio gratiæ in ecclesia, videlicet missio, illuminatio ac conservatio apostolorum, doctorum et pastorum, collectio ecclesiæ per prædicationem evangelii et dispensationem sacramentorum, regeneratio, etc. Regnum gloriæ conspicietur in resuscitatione mortuorum et universali judicio ejusque executione. Comp. *Thummius* (*Theod.*) De triplici Christi Officio. Tub. 1627, 4.—On the different interpretation of the Reformed, see *Schneckenburger*, 3d division. In particular, the Reformed limited the regal office to the regnum gratiæ. (Prayers to Christ.) [The doctrine of the three offices was taught from the very first by the Reformed divines, while the Lutheran divines for a long time spoke of only two offices, the regal and priestly. See *Heppe*, Dogmatik des deutschen Protest. ii. 222. *Calvin*, Inst. ii. 15, 1: Tribus partibus constat quod ei injunctum a patre munus fuit, et propheta datus est, et rex, et sacerdos.]

[5] The theologians of Tubingen (*Luke Osiander*, *Theodore Thummius*, and *Melchior Nicolai*), supposed that Christ, during his state of humiliation, continued to possess the divine properties of omnipotence, omnipresence, etc., but concealed them from men; the divines of Giessen (*Menzer* and *Feuerborn*) asserted that he voluntarily laid them aside. For further particulars, see *Dorner*, p. 179, ss. *Schröckh*, iv. p. 970, ss. Comp. *Thummii ταπειγωσιγραφία* sacra, Tub., 1623, 4, and *Nicolai* Consideratio Theolog. IV Quæstionum controversarum de profundissima *κενώσει* Christi, ibidem 1622, 4. *Gass*, p. 277.

[6] *Æpinus* (John Höck, or Hoch, in Greek, *αἰπεινός*, died 1533), in a criticism published in 1544, on an exposition of Ps. xvi. by his colleague *Feder* (Höck's critique published, Francof. 1644), taught that Christ's descent to hell belonged to his state of humiliation, because his soul suffered the punishments of hell, while his body remained in the grave. He denied that 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, has a reference to the descensus ad inferos, but was opposed by his colleagues in Hamburg. Flacius defended Höck. The Formula Concordiæ cut short further questions by declaring the article in question to be one, qui neque sensibus, neque ratione nostra comprehendi queat, sola autem fide acceptandus sit. See *Planck*, v. 1, p. 251, ss. *Schröckh*, l. c. p. 541, ss.

[The Westminster Confession explains the Descensus as equivalent to "remaining under the power of death." Comp. Larger Catechism, Qu. 50. The XXXIX. Articles, Art. 3: "As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell." The Article as published under King Edward was much fuller, adding, "For the body of Christ lay in the sepulchre until the resurrection; but his ghost departing from him, was with the ghosts which were in prison, or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify." See *Burnet*, pp. 69–73. Pearson on Creed, pp. 333–371. The latter says, "though his body was dead, yet his soul died not; and though it died not, yet it underwent the condition of the souls of such as die; and being he died in the similitude of a sinner, his soul went to the place where souls of men are kept who die for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death; but because there was no sin in him, and he had fully satisfied for the sins of others, which he took upon him, therefore as God suffered not the Holy One to see corruption, so he left not his soul in hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to Christ, of never coming under the power of Satan, or suffering in the flames prepared for the devil and his angels."]

§ 268.

THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

* *Weisse*, M. Lutherus, quid de Consilio Mortis et Resurrectionis Christi senserit. Lips., 1845.—[*Schneider*, The Lutheran Doctrine of Christ's Vicarious Death, transl. from Studien und Kritiken, in British and Foreign Evang. Review, Jan. 1861. *Jas. R. Wilson*, Hist. Sketch of Opinions on the Atonement. Phil., 1817.—*Stillingfleet* (Bishop of Worcester), Two Discourses concerning the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction (against Socinians and Antinomians.) London, 1697, 1700. Grotian theory of the Atonement, by *F. C. Baur*, translated by *L. Swain*, in Bibliotheca Sacra, ix. 259–272.]

As Protestants and Roman Catholics agreed in resting their doctrines concerning theology and christology on the basis of the œcumenical symbols [the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, and the Athanasian], so they espoused in common the doctrine of atonement as given in Anselm's theory of satisfaction,[1] only with this difference, that (in connection with other principles) the Protestants gave the preference to that aspect of this theory presented by Thomas Aquinas, while the Roman Catholics, on the contrary, were favorable (at least in part), to the scheme of Duns Scotus.[2] The Protestant theologians, however, further developing the doctrine of Anselm, carried their definitions sharply out on two points. On the one hand, they so extended the idea of vicarious suffering, as to make it include the divine curse (mors æterna)[3]—an opinion which was combated by the divines of the Romish Church.[4] On the other hand, they insisted upon the active obedience of Christ, together with the

passive, referring the former to the complete obedience which he yielded to the law.[5] Both opinions were intimately connected with the Protestant doctrine of justification. But while the advocates of orthodox Protestantism carried the doctrine of Anselm to such an extreme in one direction, as to weaken it on the other side,[6] the adherents of the negative system of *Socinus*, and those of like tendencies, endeavoured by dialectical reasoning to dissolve the whole theory, and to explain away its Scriptural basis.[7] By this atomistic treatment of the doctrine, the Socinians lost sight of the more profound significance of Christ's death, in which they saw only, either, the death of a martyr inducing others thus to lay down their lives; or, the confirmation of divine promises; or, in fine, the necessary transition to his resurrection and subsequent apotheosis.[8] The *Arminians* endeavoured to take an intermediate position between the Socinians and the advocates of the church orthodoxy. The subtile distinction made by *Grotius* between *satisfactio* and *solutio*, and the idea that God, by inflicting death upon Christ, had given in an arbitrary way an example of punishment, were untenable modifications of Anselm's theory. He thus deprived it of its characteristic features, without removing all the difficulties raised by the skeptical understanding of the Socinians.[9] After *Grotius*, *Curcellæus* and *Limborch* emphasized the idea of a sacrifice, as set forth in the Old Testament, which the theologians previous to the time of Anselm, had generally adopted.[10] This theory was introduced into the Arminian works on systematic theology, and approved by the Socinians of the next period.[11] The Quakers admitted the orthodox doctrine that redemption has once been made by the death of Christ, but connected with it the idea of a second redemption, which is realized internally. In accordance with their entire economy of redemption, and the opinions of the mystics in general, they regarded this second reconciliation as the essential redeeming principle.[12]

[1] However much Roman Catholics and Protestants differed as to the *causes* and *consequences* of Christ's death (sin and justification), they were in perfect accordance respecting its object. "*It is the common doctrine of Protestants and Roman Catholics, that the sufferings or merits of Christ objectively possess an infinite value.*" *Baur*, p. 344. On this account little was determined concerning this point during the earlier part of the Reformation. "*Melancthon, even in the later editions of his Loci Theologici, did not treat of the theory of satisfaction in a particular locus, nor did he expressly single it out, but included all that had reference to it, in the doctrine concerning justifying faith. The same may be said with regard to those passages in the Augustina and the Apologia which refer to the atoning death of Christ:*" *Baur*, p. 289. Comp. Conf. August., Art. iii., p. 10, Apolog. iii., p 93: Lex damnat omnes homines, sed Christus, quia sine peccato subiit pœnam peccati, et victima pro nobis factus est, instituit illud jus legis, ne accuset, ne

damnet nos qui credant in ipsum, quia credant in ipsum, quia ipse est propitiatio pro eis, propter quam nunc justi reputantur. Yet even Luther fell back upon the old representation of a legal strife with the devil, and of his being worsted therein; see his Easter Sermon, 1530; his commentary on Job, and other passages cited by *Weisse* (ubi supra), p. 29 sq.: yet on the other hand, he went beyond Anselm, and recognized the idea of satisfaction as inadequate; see *Walch*, xx., p. 989, and compare *Schenkel*, p. 227 sq. (On the relation of Luther's doctrine to that of *Osiander*, see *Weisse*, p. 83 *sq.*) In *Zwingle*, more than in Luther and Melancthon, the doctrine of satisfaction in the sense of Anselm is made prominent; yet there are also passages which indicate that he too had got beyond it; see *Schenkel*, p. 245, *sq.* In fact, "*the strict Anselmic theory of satisfaction does not come right out anywhere in the Reformed system;*" *Schweizer*, ii. 389; *Schneckenburger*, ubi supra.

["Zwingle and Calvin did indeed adhere to the dogma of satisfaction in its traditional form; but from their point of view the satisfaction itself was subsumed under the idea of the absolute decree, in relation to which the satisfaction of Christ was not the causa meritoria of salvation, but only the causa instrumentalis, carrying out the purpose of redemption; and the object of the death and sufferings of Christ was, not the objective mediation of redemption, but only the strengthening of the subjective assurance of salvation. To this is to be added, that the preliminaries of the strict satisfaction theory failed in the Reformed theology, on account of their views as to the person of Christ. For as all active and passive obedience becomes a satisfaction, only as it is the obedience of a person whose divine nature imparts to it an infinite value; and since, in the Reformed view, the whole obedience and suffering of the God-man fell upon the human side (so that the non-obligation of obedience to the law can be asserted only of the Logos in himself, and not of the incarnate Logos, who is essentially only man, developed in successive stages); it follows, that the God-man by his obedience merited something for himself, and that others have part therein, only so far as they belong essentially to him, and realize in themselves the same obedience, which he, as the ideal, performed for them. And hence we have among the Reformed, the idea of a life communion with Christ taking the place of the Lutheran notion of satisfaction:" *Baur*, p. 328. This view of Baur (and Schneckenburger), is undoubtedly pressed beyond the historical data, although it indicates some tendencies of the Calvinistic system, which have been much overlooked, and of which the later German divines have made more use. There can be no question that the idea of *satisfaction* was made prominent by all the leading Calvinistic divines. See *Heppe*, Dogmatik d. Ref. Kirche, p. 340, *sq.* As to the absolute necessity of this satisfaction, *Calvin* said (Inst. ii. 12, 1): De necessitate si quæritur, non *simplex* vel *absoluta* fuit, sed manavit ex *cœlesti decreto*, unde pendebat hominum salus. Later divines expressed themselves more strongly (see Turretine, xiv. 10, 4). *Cocceius*, Summa Theol. derives its necessity: (1.) A justitia Dei; (2.) Ex lege operum; (3.) A legis impotentia; (4.) A maledictione; (5.) Ex typo (the types) et commemoratione per eum facta; (6.) Ex vocibus scripturæ significantibus satisfactionem. Comp. *Heppe*, p. 342.—As to the extent of the redemption, earlier indefinite statements (*e. g.* Calvin, the Heidelberg Cate-

chism, etc.), gave way to the scheme of particularism; although the death of Christ was well nigh unanimously held to be sufficient for all, and to be offered to all. But redemption was not carefully distinguished from atonement—the completed work from the ample provision. On the School of Saumur on this point, see above, § 225, *a*.—Article xxxi., of the Church of England says: "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." *Westminster Confession*, ch. viii. 5: "The Lord Jesus Christ by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he through the eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of the Father, and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him." *Owen* (Works, x. 259), puts "this dilemma to our Universalists: God imposed his wrath due unto, and Christ underwent the pains of hell for, either all the sins of all men, or all the sins of some men, or some sins of all men. If the last, some sins of all men, then have all men some sins to answer for, and so shall no man be saved....If the second, that is it which we affirm....If the first, why then are not all freed from the punishment of all their sins." *Baxter* taught a universal atonement; Methodus Theol., Part iii. c. 1.]

[2] There were indeed some eminent Roman Catholic writers, among them even *Bellarmine*, who sided with Thomas Aquinas, but (to judge from occasional expressions) it would appear that even with them the scheme of Duns Scotus had in some respects greater authority. Comp. *Baur*, p. 345, with p. 348. A further difference was this, that in the opinion of the Roman Catholics, by the death of Christ satisfaction was made only for guilt contracted before baptism; while only the *eternal* punishment, due to mortal sins committed after baptism, has been remitted; so that Christians have themselves to make satisfaction for temporal punishments. They also asserted that the merits of Christ were supererogatory, while Protestants thought they were equivalent to the penalties to be inflicted upon men. Comp. the passages quoted by *Winer*, p. 77. And, lastly, according to Roman Catholics, Christ by his sufferings obtained merit for himself; this opinion was also adopted by some Calvinistic theologians (*e. g. Piscator*). See *Baur*, pp. 349, 350. Among the Protestants themselves, the Reformed Church approximated more nearly to the Scotist *acceptilatio* than did the Lutherans. See *Schneckenburger*, ubi supra.

[3] *Gerhard*, Loci Theologici, xvii. ii. c. 54: Quomodo enim peccata nostra vere in se suscepisset ac perfectam satisfactionem præstitisset, nisi iram Dei individuo nexu cum peccatis conjunctam vere sensisset? Quomodo a maledicto legis nos redemisset, factus pro nobis maledictum, nisi judicium Dei irati persensisset?—Nor did the Heidelb. Catechism restrict the passive obedience of Christ to his sacrifice made on the cross (as Anselm had done), for it expressly states (Qu. 37) that Christ "bore the divine wrath during the whole period of his earthly life." And in Qu. 44 mention is made of his *mental sufferings*, to which the theologians of the Reformed Church, generally speaking, attached greater importance. See *Beckhaus*, l. c. pp. 68, 69.

[4] *Bellarmine* pronounced this doctrine "a new, unheard-of heresy." *Baur*, p. 348.

[5] This doctrine of obedientia activa was most prominently brought forward in the Formula Concordiæ. On the question whether, and in what manner, it had previously existed, see the Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung, 1834, p. 523, and on the other side, *Baur*, p. 297, note. "*Even Ch. W. F. Walch, so well read in theological literature, observes in his Comment. de Obedient. Christi activa*, p. 30: *Quis primus hujus formulæ fuerit auctor, certe definire non audeo.*" *Baur*, p. 301. Comp., however, *Weisse*, ubi supra, p. 52, *sq.*, *Schenkel*, i. 267, *sq.* Form. Conc. p. 684: Cum enim Christus non tantum homo, verum Deus et homo sit in una persona indivisa, tam non fuit legi subjectus, quam non fuit passioni et morti (ratione suæ personæ) obnoxius, quia Dominus legis erat. Eam ob causam ipsius obedientia (non ea tantum, qua Patri paruit in tota sua passione et morte, verum etiam, qua nostra causa sponte sese legi subjecit, eamque obedientia illa sua implevit) nobis ad justitiam imputatur, ita, ut Deus propter totam obedientiam, quam Christus *agendo et patiendo*, in vita et morte sua, nostra causa Patri suo cœlesti præstitit, peccata nobis remittat, pro bonis et justis nos reputet, et salute æterna donet.—Pag. 686: Propter obedientiam Christi, quam Christus inde a nativitate sua usque ad ignominiosissimam crucis mortem pro nobis Patri suo præstitit, boni et justi pronuntiantur et reputantur. Comp. p. 696: [Cum autem, ut supra commemoratum est, obedientia illa Christi, non sit unius duntaxat naturæ, sed totius personæ: ideo ea est perfectissima pro humano genere satisfactio et expiatio, qua æternæ et immutabili justitiæ divinæ satis est factum. *Flacius*, quoted by *Baur*, p. 327: Tota vita filii tam obedientiæ tam passionis nomine comprehendi potest. Nam et obedientia fuit perpetua quædam passio, et passio perpetua obedientia.] Nor did the earlier Calvinistic theologians make a distinction between obedientia activa et passiva. Calvin comprehends both together; see Inst. ii. 16, 5. See *Baur*, p. 333. On the contrary, the Form. Consens. which was afterwards composed, agreed with the Form. Concordiæ (in opposition to *George Karg* and *Piscator*. See § 269), in Art. 15: Spiritus quoque Dei rotundo ore asserit, Christum sanctissima sua vita legi et justitiæ divinæ pro nobis satisfecisse, et pretium illud, quo emti sumus Deo, non in passionibus duntaxat, sed tota ejus vita legi conformata collocat. Comp. *Thomasius*, Dogmatis de Obedientia activa Historia, Erlang., 1846, II., 4to. [Calvin's statement is: Ubi quæritur, quomodo dissidium Christi inter nos et Deum sustulerit et justitiam acquisierit, generaliter responderi potest, *tota obedientia suæ cursu hoc* nobis præstitisse.—Ex quo induit personam servi, cœpit ad nos redimendos prætium liberationis solvere. Scriptura tamen hoc *morti Christi quasi peculiare* adscribit.—*Neque tamen excluditur reliqua pars obedientiæ, qua defunctus est in vita.* Et sane primum gradum occupat voluntaria subjectio, etc. Inst. ii. 16, 5. *Wollebius*, 81: Mandatum patris, cui obedivit Christus, speciale et generale fuit: speciale, respectu finis, ut non pro se, sed pro nobis obediret: generale vero, respectu objecti. Eidem enim legi subjectus fuit, quæ nobis præscripta est, et in omnibus, ad quæ lex nos obstrinxit. Comp. *Heppe*, Dogmatik der Ref. Kirche, p. 336. He says that the older German Reformed divines taught that the active obedience

of Christ was for himself; but that later (after Piscator denied the imputation of this active obedience), it was usual to view it in a twofold aspect and relation, on the one hand, to Christ as a man; on the other hand, to Christ as sponsor and mediator for man. Still later (*e. g.* in *Burmann*), it was more precisely defined by the notions of subjectio sub lege naturalis, and fœderalis. *Turretine* distinguished a threefold subjection to the law, naturalis, fœderalis, and pœnalis. The *Westminster Confession* does not separate the two.]

[6] It carried the doctrine to an extreme, by annexing the idea of divine wrath, and of the punishment of hell; it weakened it by adding the obedientia activa, since the redeeming element was then no longer exclusively connected with the pouring out of the blood, and the agony endured, but diffused through the whole life and only concentrated in the sacrificial death.

[7] *Sebastian Frank* and *Thamer* had preceded in this line; see *Schenkel*, i. 254, *sq.* But *Ochino* tries more particularly (in his Dialogues, Basel, 1563), to transform the objective satisfaction-theory of the church into an act of subjective reflection, whereby man comes to see that God is disposed to forgive him, when he is penitent; see *Schenkel*, ii. 265, *sq.* To these forerunners, *F. Socinus* attaches himself in his Prælect. Theol., (see *Baur*, p. 371, *sq.* *Fock*, p. 615, *sq.*) He endeavors to show that the terms satisfactio and remissio peccatorum contradict each other. Where *satisfaction* has been made, forgiveness is no longer required, and where sin must be remitted, no satisfaction has been made (for to forgive implies that grace takes the place of justice.) Debts are either remitted or claimed. If another make the payment, it has the same value as if it had been paid by the debtor himself, and a gift is out of the question. Nor can punishments be compared to debts. The former are something quite personal, which cannot be transferred from one person to another. The sufferings of the innocent could not satisfy the requirements of divine justice, which demanded the punishment of the guilty. But mercy could pardon without inflicting punishment. And, lastly, what Christ has done and suffered for us, is no true equivalent. Not only has the whole human race deserved eternal death, but *every* sinner for himself deserves the same penalty. But Christ did not die eternal death, and his temporal death was only *one* (not several deaths). Further, the sufferings and death of Christ had not the character of punishment, but formed his transition to glory. Nor can we speak of active obedience, because the man Christ owed it to God for himself; besides, one man could render obedience only for one man, but not one man for all.—*Socinus* also pointed out the (possible) immoral consequences of the Protestant doctrine of justification (as did all its opponents.)—In respect to the interpretation of Scripture, there was no need here of being as arbitrary, as in the Christology. Comp. *Baur*, 391. *Fock*, 631. "It can hardly be denied, that the Socinians, in their attack upon the doctrine of satisfaction, did all that was possible from their standpoint. The sharp, intellectual dialectics of Socinianism struck so precisely at the weak points of the church doctrine, and exposed its defects so clearly, that it was difficult, if not impossible, for the latter to ward off with success this dexterous and superior assault." Ibid. p. 637.

[8] *Socinus* defined the object of Christ's death *positively* as follows; 1. *The death of Christ was an example set before men for their imitation:* Christ. Relig. Inst. (Biblioth. Fratr. Polon. T. i. p. 667): Christus suorum fidelium servator est, primum, quia sui ipsius exemplo illos ad viam salutis, quam ingressi jam sunt, perpetuo tenendam movet atque inducit.... Quomodo vero suo exemplo potuisset Christus movere atque inducere suos fideles ad singularem illam probitatem et innocentiam perpetuo retinendam, sine qua servari nequeunt, nisi ipse prior cruentam mortem, quæ illam facile comitatur, gustasset? Men imitating his example will also be delivered from sin. Præl. Theol. p. 591: Tollit peccata Christus, quia ad pœnitentiam agendam, qua peccata delentur, cœlestibus iisque amplissimis promissis omnes allicit et movere potens est.... Tollit.... peccata, quia vitæ suæ innocentissimæ exemplo omnes, qui deploratæ spei non fuerint, ad justitiæ et sanctitatis studium, peccatis relictis amplectendum, facillime adducit. The deliverance from sin is brought about in a psychologico-moral way. 2. *It was the confirmation of the promises made by God:* De Jesu Christo Servatore P. 1; c. 3 (Bibl. T. ii. p. 127): Mortuus igitur est Christus, ut novum et æternum Dei fœdus, cujus ipse mediator fuerat, stabiliret ac conservaret. Et adeo hac ratione divina promissa confirmavit, ut Deum ipsum quodammodo ad ea nobis præstanda devinxerit, et sanguis ejus assidue ad patrem clamat, ut promissorum suorum, quæ ipse Christus nobis illius nomine annunciavit, pro quibus confirmandis suum ipsius sanguinem fundere non recusavit, meminisse velit.—Comp. Cat. Racov. qu. 383. With this is connected the assurance of the forgiveness of sins: De Christo serv. c. 13: Morte Christi, seu ejus supplicio peracto, nemo est, qui Deum nos suprema caritate amplexum non agnoscat, eum erga nos placatissimum non videat, et jam sibi universa delicta condonata esse, pro certo habeat. 3. *The necessary means preparatory to his resurrection, by which he entered into glory.* Cat. Racov. p. 265 (see *Winer*, p. 74):.... Deinde (mortuus est) quod per mortem pervenerit ad resurrectionem, ex qua maxima oritur divinæ voluntatis confirmatio deque nostra resurrectione et vitæ æternæ adeptione certissima persuasio. —With this is connected the feeling of compassion which Christ, in his state of exaltation, has toward men, on account of which he delivers them from death, Christ. Relig. Institut. p. 667, de Jesu Chr. serv. p. 133. See *Baur*, p. 410: "Inasmuch as Christ employs the power granted to him by God in forgiving men their sins, and making them partakers of eternal life, the Socinians admit him to be high priest; but as Christ exercises his functions of high priest in heaven alone, his priestly office does not essentially differ from the kingly." Comp. the passages quoted from the symbolical books of the Socinians by *Winer*, pp. 74, 75, and *Flatt*, Beiträge zur christlichen Dogmatik und Moral, Tüb., 1792.

[9] *Grotius*, in his treatise: Defensio Fidei Catholicæ de Satisfactione Christi, 1617, combated the views of Socinus, and argued from the juridical proposition (c. 2): Punire non est actus competens parti offensæ, quâ tali. God may indeed be considered as the offended party, but in inflicting punishments he does not punish, quâ pars offensa (sicut jurisconsultus eamt non quâ jurisconsultus, sed quâ musicus). The right of punishing belongs to God as the Sovereign of the universe, independently of any offence

which may have been given to him. Punishment has a political design (ordinis nimirum conservationem et exemplum): for justice is not manifested in avenging injuries, or compelling debtors to pay their debts (which he might voluntarily remit), but in punishing the wicked. That in certain cases the punishment falls upon the innocent, proves nothing; similar instances might be adduced from the history of nations, *e. g.*, the decimating of the Roman legions! Nihil ergo iniquitatis in eo est, quod Deus, cujus est summa potestas ad omnia per se non injusta, nulli ipse legi obnoxius, cruciatibus et morte Christi uti voluit ad statuendum exemplum grave adversus culpas immensas nostrum omnium, quibus Christus erat conjunctissimus natura, regno, vadimonio (c. 4, towards the end). He endeavored to meet the objection made by Socinus, by making a distinction between satisfactio and solutio. The latter indeed excludes the remissio peccatorum, because matters having been settled between creditor and debtor, no further demand can be made upon the latter. But the satisfactio (in the sense applied to it by Grotius) does not exclude the possibility of a remissio (c. 6, 6. p. 78.)—Comp. *Luden*, Hugo Grotius, p. 100, ss. Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, 1834, No. 66.—*Seisen* (see above § 180), p. 90, ss.—In the formal juridical aspect, the theory of Grotius resembled that of Anselm, but was not so profound, either from the theological or juridical point of view. It was based upon political rather than jural premises, and seemed to ascribe to God a despotic character. It could not satisfy either the feelings or the reason of Christians, while the theory of Anselm accomplished the former, and that of the Socinians the latter, though both were one-sided and imperfect. Grotius, indeed, not only rejected the idea of "Acceptilation," but also unjustly charged Socinus with holding it; nevertheless "*there is no theory to which the idea of acceptilation could be applied with greater propriety than to that of Grotius.*" Baur, p. 428. "*Grotius, as well as Socinus, attached principal importance to the moral impression which the death of Christ is calculated to produce, with this difference only, that Grotius takes this moral principle negatively, Socinus positively; for, in the opinion of Grotius, the moral effect of Christ's death consists in the exhibition of the punishment due to sin; according to Socinus, in the moral courage which Christ manifested in his death.*" Baur, pp. 431, 432. Nor was the theory of Grotius in accordance with the (orthodox) doctrine concerning the nature of Christ, since the effect spoken of by Grotius might have been produced by another than a God-man; comp. ibid. p. 433.—The defects of this theory were exposed by *Crell*, a Socinian writer, in his Responsio ad librum Hug. Grotii, quem de satisfactione Christi adversum Faustum Socinum Senensem scripsit., 1623, in Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. v. p. 1, ss. Concerning this treatise, and the further progress of the controversy, see *Baur*, p. 438, ss.

[10] *Curcellæus*, Rel. Christ. Instit. v. 19, 15, ss., advanced the same arguments against the theory of Anselm which Socinus had made use of, but laid greater stress upon the idea of *sacrifice:* Non ergo, ut vulgo putant, satisfecit Christus patiendo omnes pœnas, quas peccatis nostris merueramus: nam primo istud ad sacrificii rationem non pertinet, sacrificia enim non sunt solutiones debitorum; secundo Christus non est passus mortem æternam, quæ erat pœna peccato debita, nam paucis tantum horis in cruce pependit

et tertia die resurrexit. Imo etiamsi mortem æternam pertulisset, non videtur satisfacere potuisse pro omnibus totius mundi peccatis; hæc enim fuisset tantum una mors, quæ omnibus mortibus, quas singuli pro suis peccatis meruerant, non æquivaluisset. *Limborch* also rested his argumentation mainly upon the idea of sacrifice (Apol. Thes. 3, 22, 5), which, according to his definition, is not plenaria satisfactio pro peccatis, but only the condition of the gratuita peccati remissio.... Voluntas divina in unica hac victima acquievit. Comp. Baur, p. 442, ss.

[11] See Baur, p. 451, note.

[12] Barclay, Apol. Thes. vii. 2, given by *Winer*, p. 76; *Baur*, p. 467, ss. Concerning the other mystics, *Schwenkfeld*, *Weigel*, *Böhme*, see ibid., p. 459, ss., and comp. the §§ on justification and sanctification.

§ 269.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION WITHIN THE LUTHERAN AND REFORMED CHURCHES.

Osiander, a Lutheran theologian, propounded a theory respecting the sufferings of Christ, in connection with his views of the relation in which justification stands to sanctification. In his opinion it was only the *Divine* nature of our Lord which became our righteousness,[1] while, according to the orthodox doctrine, Christ suffered death on our account in his character as God-man. On the other hand, *Stancarus* asserted, that it was only the *human* nature of our Saviour which submitted to suffering.[2] But his opinion was rejected by the orthodox theologians of the three principal sections of the Church. Among the Calvinistic theologians, *John Piscator* of Herborn (after the example of *George Karg*, a Lutheran clergyman), as well as *John Cameron* of Saumur, combated the doctrine of an obedientia activa, maintaining that Christ for himself owed active obedience to God.[3] In opposition to the views of these individuals, as well as to those of the sects, both Lutheran and Calvinistic divines firmly established, and formally developed, the doctrine of satisfaction. In works on systematic theology, it took its place in Christology, along with the three offices of Christ (viz., as his priestly office); with justification in the Lutheran system as the causa meritoria of salvation, in the Reformed, as the causa instrumentalis.[4]

[1] Conf. M. 3, p. 93: Diserte et clare respondeo, quod sec. divinam suam naturam sit nostra justitia, et non sec. humanam naturam, quamvis hanc divinam justitiam extra ejus humanam naturam non possumus invenire.... consequi aut apprehendere; verum cum ipse per fidem in nobis habitat, tum affert suam justitiam, quæ est ejus divina natura, secum in nos, quæ deinde nobis etiam imputatur ac si esset nostra propria, immo et donatur nobis manatque ex ipsius humana natura, tamquam ex capite, etiam in nos, tamquam ipsius

membra. See *Schenkel*, i. 300, *sq.*, 355, *sq.* On the relation in which his doctrine stood to some earlier opinions respecting Christ's mystical body, see *Baur*, pp. 327, 328. Concerning similar views entertained by *Calvin*, who also violently opposed Osiander, see *Baur*, i. 331 ; *Schenkel*, ii. 369. (Among the opponents of Osiander, *Mörlin* took the rudest view of redemption, exhibiting it naively in a dramatic way ; *Schenkel*, ii. 367.) [On *Osiander*, see the references, p. 149, ante. "The real antagonism to the theory of satisfaction which laid the stress upon the penal sufferings of Christ's death, was found in that view, which (as in Luther) insisted most upon the organic connection of the God-man with humanity ; or upon the fact that he entered into the whole cause of our natural and legal existence, into the most intimate life-communion with man, and overcame victoriously, from his birth to the resurrection, all the hostile powers to which the race is subject. On the same side are those who conceived of Christ as the God-man, or ideal man, as being in such intimate relation to humanity, that their very conception of Christ's person contains all that is comprised in the doctrines of redemption and atonement—as, *e. g. Osiander*, *Schwenkfeld*, *Frank*, and others." *Baur*, p. 327.]

[2] *Franciscus Stancarus*, of Mantua (died 1574, in Poland.) His theory, which was represented as Nestorianism, was condemned by both Protestants (Form. Concord.) and Roman Catholics (*Bellarmine*, see *Baur*, p. 347.) Calvin also opposed him. *Wigand*, de Stancarismo et Osiandrismo, 1585, 4. Schlüsselburg, Cat. Hæret. lib. ix.

[3] *John Piscator*, a Calvinistic theologian in Herborn, lived towards the close of the sixteenth and commencement of the seventeenth century ; see *Schweizer*, Centraldogmen, ii. 17. [Gass, Prot. Dogmatik, i. 163, 383, 422.] *George Karg* (Parsimonius) gave publicity in his views, A. D. 1563, but renounced them 1570. Comp. *Walch*, Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten der evangelischlutherischen Kirche, Vol. iv. p. 360, ss. *Baur*, p. 352 ss. *Schröckh*, v. 358. *Schweizer*, ii. 16. On *Cameron*, see ibid. 235, *sq.*

[4] Compare the compendiums of systematic theology. *De Wette*, p. 156, *sq.* *Schneckenburger*, ubi supra. *Schweizer*, Glaubenslehre der ref. Kirche, ii. 389.

The theory of Anselm made the appearance of Christ on earth dependent upon the existence of sin ; according to *Osiander* and the *Socinians* he would have manifested himself though there had been no sin in the world. *Osiander* investigated this subject very fully in a separate treatise (which has now become rare): An Filius Dei fuerit incarnandus si peccatum non introivisset in mundum ? Königsb., 1550. Comp. *Schlusselburg*, Cat. Hær. lib. vi., p. 48 ss. ; *Baur*, p. 329. On the Socinians, see Fock, p. 506 sq. [On the question of an incarnation apart from sin, see *Julius Müller*, in Deutsche Zeitschrift, Oct., 1850. *Flörke*, Zeitschrift fur die Luth. Theol., 1854, pp. 209–249.]

§ 270.

BAPTISM.

J. W. Höfling, Lehre von der Taufe, Erlangen, 1846. [*E. B. Pusey*, in Tracts for the Times, No. 67, 3d. ed., 1840. Chronological Catena on Baptism, Lond. 1852. Tracts for Times, No 76: Testimony of writers in the English Church to the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. *W. Goode*, Doctrine of the Church of England as to the effects of Baptism in the case of Infants, Lond. 1849, 2d. ed., 1850.]

Among the doctrines in which Roman Catholics and Protestants preserved a certain agreement, in opposition to the minor religious sects, was that concerning baptism.[1] For though the baptismal ritual itself was different with the Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists;[2] though differences of opinion obtained respecting the efficacy of baptism, as regards original sin, and the fate of those children who die unbaptised,[3] and as to the capacity of faith in the baptized and the degree of grace conferred in the rite;[4] yet Protestants and Catholics entertained essentially the same view of the *nature of baptism*, asserting, 1. Its general necessity, in opposition to the Quakers;[5] 2. Its sacramental character, in opposition to the Socinians;[6] and chiefly, 3. The necessity of infant baptism in opposition to the Anabaptists (Mennonites).[7] And, lastly, the Roman Catholics, in accordance with their view of the baptism of heretics, were compelled to acknowledge the validity of Protestant baptism, while, on the other hand, the Protestants always regarded Romish baptism as a Christian ordinance, and never thought of re-baptising those who were converted to their own faith.[8] [Some Anglican divines denied the validity of any baptism administered in opposition to "the divine right of apostolical succession."][9]

[1] *Of all the sacraments, that of baptism is the one respecting which Roman Catholics could always unite most easily with Protestants, and would have had the least reason for framing particular canons, in order to keep up any difference in respect to points of secondary importance.*" *Marheineke*, Symbolik, i. p. 149. The reformers also declared, that of all the sacraments, that of baptism was least corrupted, and that this ordinance had more than any other been preserved from the addition of heterogeneous elements. *Lutheri* Opp. Lat. Jen. T. ii. p. 284 (in Marheineke, l. c.)

[2] On the use of chrisma (ointment), of salts, the lactis et mellis degustatio, and other ceremonies common among Roman Catholics, the formulas of exorcism used by Lutherans, etc., as well as on the usages of the Greek Church, see the works on archæology. "As regards the water," said *Zwingle* (Von der Taufe, Works, ii. p. 299), "it should be taken good, fresh, and pure; for as John baptised in the river Jordan, we ought not to allow the bishops to attach so much importance to the salt." Yet there still remained

in the Protestant church many superstitions in respect to the baptismal water. Comp. *Gerhard*, Loci Theol., xxi. c. 8, § 170.

[3] Comp. § 246. According to the Roman Catholic doctrine, original sin being removed by baptism, all that remains in the baptised is the concupiscentia, which is lex fomitis, but not sin; in the opinion of the Protestants, original sin still remains in the baptised (as they regarded concupiscence itself as sinful), but is no longer imputed. Comp. Conc. Trid. Sess. 5, 5, and on the other side Apol. p. 56: [Hic flagellant adversarii etiam Lutherum, quod scripserit, peccatum originis manere post baptismum....Sciunt enim adversarii, in quam sententiam Lutherus hoc dictum velit, quod peccatum originis reliquum sit post baptismum. Semper ita scripsit, quod baptismus tollat reatum peccati originalis, etiamsi materiale, ut isti vocant, peccati maneat, videlicet concupiscentia. Addidit etiam de materiali, quod Spiritus Sanctus, datus per baptismum, incipit mortificare concupiscentiam et novos motus creat in homine.]—For further passages, see *Winer*, p. 64, and especially Calvin, Institut. iv. c. 15, § 10: [Hæc itaque duo distincte observanda; nempe quod sic omnibus naturæ nostræ partibus vitiati perversique, jam ob talem duntaxat corruptionem damnati merito, convicique coram Deo tenemur, cui nihil est acceptum nisi justitia, innocentia, puritas. Atque adeo infantes quoque ipsi suam secum damnationem a matris utero asserunt; qui tametsi suæ iniquitatis fructus nondum protulerint, habent tamen in se inclusum semen. The baptised, he adds, obtain justitia, sed talem in hac vita obtinere populus Dei potest, nempe imputatione duntaxat, quia pro justis et innocentibus eos sua misericordia Dominus habet.)—Concerning the condemnation of unbaptised children, see *Winer*, p. 131, ss.

[4] While the Lutherans, after the precedence of Luther (see *Schenkel*, i. 140, *sq.*), assumed an actual *faith* on the part of the children, and thus viewed the baptismal grace in an objective way; the Reformed contented themselves with the statement, that children by baptism were received into covenant with God, even though there was no faith on their part. Compare on the Lutheran side *Gerhard*, Loci Theol., xxi. c. 8, § 222: Quamvis τεκμήρια et effectus fidei in infantibus non ita in oculos et sensus externos incurrant, ut fidei in adultis, non tamen ob id omnes fidei fructus in infantibus sunt negandi, cum Scriptura ipsis tribuat Dei laudem (Ps. viii. 3), Dei cognitionem (1 John, ii. 14), victoriam mundi (c. v. 4), quos esse fidei fructus et bona opera nemo inficias iverit.....Arbor bona in media hieme non destituitur proprietate bonos fructus proferendi, quamvis exterius id non appareat: et nos fidem infantibus ex eo negabimus, quod externos ejusdem fructus non proferant? Ut in seminibus et surculis arborum res se habet, quamquam non ferunt fructus, tamen inest eis vis et natura, ut fructus suo tempore producant: sic infantum fides ἐνέργειαν exteriorem suo tempore exserit et fert fructus Deo placentes.—On the other hand, the Reformed took the ground, *e. g.*, *Musculus*, p. 336: Infantulos habere fidem, non probare possumus, nec satis est occultam habere fidem, sed fidei professio requiritur, quæ certo illis tribui non potest. *Vitringa*, Aphorism, p. 250: Baptizandi sunt fidelium infantes, quia juste præsumtio est, quod a Spiritu Sancto ut hæreditas Christi

occupati sint et suo tempore vere sint crediturі. Comp. *Schweizer*, Glaubenslehre der reform. Kirche, ii. 620.

[The divines of the Church of England taught the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, yet with cautions. Bishop *Jewel*, on Sacraments, p. 253: "We are not washed from our sins by the water, we are not fed to eternal life by the bread and wine, but by the precious blood of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, that lieth hid in these sacraments." "For this cause are infants baptised, because they are born in sin, and cannot become spiritual but by this new birth of the water and the Spirit." *Richard Hooker*, Eccles. Pol., Book v. 60: "Unless as the Spirit is a necessary inward cause, so water were a necessary outward means to our regeneration, what construction should be given to those words wherein we are said to be new born, and that ἐξ ὕδατος, even of water? Baptism is the door of our actual entrance into God's house, the first apparent beginning of life, *a seal perhaps to the grace of election before received:* but to our sanctification here, a step which hath not any before it." *Jackson* on Christ's Priesthood, ch. i. (vol. iii. p. 271): "It is no part of our Church's doctrine or meaning, that the washing or sprinkling infants' bodies with consecrated water, should take away sins by its own immediate virtue.... The meaning is, that if the sacrament of baptism be duly administered, the blood, or bloody sacrifice of Christ, or (which is all one) the influence of his Spirit doth always accompany, or is *concurrent* to *this* solemn act.... This sacramental pledge hath a virtual presence of Christ's blood, or some real influence from his Body, concomitant, though not consubstantiated to it, which is prefigured or signified by the washing or sprinkling the body with water."—*Jeremy Taylor*, Life of Christ, section 9: Baptism "does not heal the wounds of actual sins [in infants], because they have not committed them; but it takes off the evil of original sin: whatsoever is imputed to us by Adam's prevarication, is washed off by the death of the second Adam, into which we are baptised." *Pearson* on the Creed, Art. ix.: Baptism "is infallibly efficacious as to this particular, that is to the remission of all sins committed before the administration of the sacrament." *Waterland*, of Regeneration, 2: "Their [infants'] innocence and incapacity are to them instead of repentance, which they do not need, and of actual faith, which they cannot have.... They stipulate, they enter into contract, by their sureties, upon a presumptive and interpretative consent." See Tracts for Times, No. 76.]

[b] Comp. § 258, note 7, in the sacraments.

[c] *Zwingle* may herein be considered as the forerunner of the Socinians, so far as this, that his statements on baptism are much behind the later definition of the Reformed church, and are essentially different from those of Luther. In his Confes. ad Carolum V., baptism is viewed as having only the significancy of being received into the church: Non quod baptismus rem præstet, sed ut rem prius præstitam multitudini testeter. Zwingle Vom Touf (Werke, ii. 1, p. 301): "No element or external thing in this world can purify the soul, but the purification of the soul is only of the grace of God. So it follows, that baptism cannot wash away any sin. As it can not wash sin away, and yet has been appointed of God, it must be a *sign of dedication* of the people of God, and *nothing at all else*." So, too, the Socinians view

baptism as merely a rite of consecration. It has not an effective, but only a declarative, significancy. *F. Socinus*, De Baptismo Aquæ Disput. (in Bibl. Fratrum Polon., i. p. 709 sq.) p. 720: In nomine Jesu Christi aqua baptizari nihil aliud est, quam publice Christo nomen dare, ejusque fidem, quæ in corde latet, palam testari ac profiteri, uta ut non Christianum ulla ex parte baptismus *efficiat*, sed *indicet* atque declarat. Comp. the symbols in *Winer*, p. 128, and *Fock*, p. 582 sq. Similiar views were entertained by the Arminians and Mennonites, who regarded baptism as a symbolical communication of grace, ibid. p. 129. *Luther* expressed himself very differently in his Postille, iii. 34, Walch, xii., p. 714: "And thus the *blood of Christ* is so intimately mingled with the water of baptism, that we should neither regard it as merely clean water, but look upon it as water beautifully colored and reddened with the precious rose-colored blood of our dear Saviour." (The circumstance of water and blood flowing out of Christ's side, he referred to baptism, others to the Lord's Supper.) Comp. also his Catech. Major: "Perceive ye now that [the water of] baptism is very different from all other kinds of water, not on account of its nature, but because something higher has been added—viz. the glory, power, and might of God himself. Therefore it is not only natural water, but Divine, heavenly, holy and blessed water, and what other praise may be bestowed upon it, all on account of the Word, which is a holy, heavenly Word, which can not be too highly spoken of." *John Gerhard*, however (Loci Theol. xxi., c. 7, § 122), speaks against a merely physical (magical) union of divine grace with the water: Nec dicimus, quod aquæ vis regenerandi tamquam subjecto φυσικῶς inhæreat, aut quod naturali quacunque ratione et vinculo quodam insolubili gratia Spiritus Sancti ei sit adligata, sed sacramentali mysterio vim illam huic sacramento ex ordinatione divina ὀργανικῶς et ὑπερφυσικῶς ad salutem credentium conjunctam esse credimus.*

[7] The Anabaptists, like the reformers, rested their opinion on the formal principle of Scripture. Their assertion that infant baptism was not commanded in Scripture, was combated by the reformers, who in support of their opinion, appealed to Mark x. 15; 1 Cor. xvi. 15; Acts xvi. 15; but these passages do not hold good. See *Zwingle's* work "Vom Touf, vom Widertouf and vom Kindertouf" (edit. of *Schulthess*, ii. 2, p. 230), which may be compared with his Latin treatise; "In Catabaptistarum Strophas Elenchus." (Zwingle made a distinction between spiritual baptism and baptism by water. The more he regarded the latter as an external rite, the less he would hesitate to administer it to infants.) He, as well as Calvin and the successors of Calvin in general, compared infant baptism to the analogous rite of *Circumcision* under the Old Testament dispensation. *Zwingle*, l. c., p. 297: "Circumcision was a sign of faith (Rom. iv. 11), and applied to children. Now we have baptism instead of circumcision; therefore it ought also to be

* *Osiander* interprets the significancy of the water in a peculiar way. It is to him a symbol of the law. As the word of the law discloses to man the *wrath* of God, so too the water. Man's body trembles and shivers with the cold when he comes to the water, as in his soul he is terrified and made to tremble by the law. But as the law does not destroy man, so baptism is not administered to drown man; but he is drawn out of the water and lives (Romans vi. 3, 7). See *Heberle* in Studien und Kritiken, 1844, p. 408.

administered to children. They (the Anabaptists) cannot well digest the syllogism, because it is so strongly supported by the Word of God." Comp. *Calvin*, Inst. iv. 15 sq. (where however the proofs hardly all hold good). For the symbolical books of the Roman Catholic, Lutheran and Reformed Churches, see *Winer*, p. 130. [Apol. Confess. Aug. p. 156: Et cum plerosque alios errores Anabaptistarum damnamus, tum hunc quoque, quod disputant Baptismum parvulorum inutilem esse. Certissimum est enim, quod promissio salutis pertinet etiam ad parvulos. Neque vero pertinet ad illos, qui sunt extra ecclesiam Christi, ubi nec verbum, nec sacramenta sunt, quia regnum Christi tantum cum verbo, et sacramentis exstitit. Igitur necesse est baptizare parvulos, ut applicitur eis promissio salutis, juxtam mandatum Christi (Matth. xxviii. 19), ubi sicut offertur omnibus salus, ita offertur omnibus Baptismus, viris, mulieribus, pueris, infantibus.].... *Luther's* Catechism Major, p. 544: Puerorum baptismum Christo placere et gratum esse, suo ipsius opere abunde ostenditur, nempe quod Deus illorum, non paucos sanctificat, eosdemque Spiritu Sancte impertivit, qui statim a bis partu infantes baptizati sunt. Sunt etiam hodie non parum multi, quos certis indiciis animadvertimus Spiritum Sanctum habere, cum doctrinæ eorum, tum etiam vitæ nomine; sicut et nobis gratia Dei datum et concessum est, nosse Scripturas interpretari, et Christum cognoscere, quod citra Spiritum Sanctum nullo modo fieri posse, nemo dubitat. At si puerorum baptismus Christo non probaretur: nulli horum Spiritum Sanctum, aut ne particulam quidem ejus impertiret, atque ut summatim, quod sentio, eloquar, per tot sæcula quæ ad hunc usque diem elapsa sunt, nullus hominum christianus perhibendus esset. Quoniam vero Deus baptismum sui Sancti Spiritus donatione confirmat, id quod in non Patribus....non obscuris argumentis intelligitur, *neque sancta christianorum ecclesia usque ad consummationem sæculi interibit:* fateri coguntur, Deo baptismum non displicere. Neque enim sibi ipse potest esse contrarius, aut mendaciis et nequitiæ suffragari, neque huic promovendæ gratiam suam ac Spiritum suum impertire. Et hæc fere optima et firmissima est pro simplicibus et indoctis comprobatio. Neque enim hunc articulum: Credo ecclesiam catholicam, communionem sanctorum, etc., nobis eripient aut subvertent unquam.) For the views of the later Lutheran and Calvinistic theologians (concerning the faith of infants, according to Matth. xviii. 6, and the responsibility which the godfather and godmother take upon themselves), see *De Wette*, pp. 179, 180.—[In the form of the Church of England for the baptism of infants, it is said, "*this infant* must also faithfully, for *his* part, promise by you that are his sureties [viz., the godfathers and godmothers], until he come of age to take it upon himself, that he will renounce the devil and all his works," etc. And after the rite the priest says: "We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy church." In the Westminster Conf. (ch. xxviii.), baptism is declared to be "not only for the solemn admission of the party baptised into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins," etc. 6. "The efficacy of baptism is not tied to the moment of time wherein it is administered;

yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred, by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants), as the grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in his appointed time." The right to administer it to children is on the ground (Directory for Church Worship, ch. vii. 4) "that the seed of the faithful have no less a right to this ordinance than the seed of Abraham to circumcision," etc.] The *Socinians* and *Arminians* approved of infant baptism, but did not think it necessary. Comp. *Winer*, p. 232. Even from the custom of infant baptism, which he adopts, *Socinus* argues against the church doctrine, that regeneration is connected with it, since infants cannot be regenerated: Titus, iii. 5, he says, refers not to baptism with water, but to spiritual renovation; Cat. Racov. Qu. 348. *Fock*, p. 583.—*Labadie* and his followers, in accordance with their other principles, not only rejected infant baptism as such, but in general the baptism of every unregenerate person, whether young or old. See *Arnold*, Kirchen und Ketzergesch. vol. ii. B. xvii. c. 21, § 17. *Göbel*, ubi supra, p. 240.

[8] Comp. *Winer*, p. 133, note 1. It was only some fanatical priests, at the time of the Reformation, who in this respect did not act in accordance with the principles of their own church. The Mennonites at first re-baptised those who joined them, but afterwards discontinued this usage. Nor did the followers of *Labadie* re-baptise those who had been baptised in their infancy. (Arnold, l. c.) Some of the fanatical sects, however, continued to repeat the act of baptism.

[9] [See *Pusey* and *Goode*, ubi supra. *Roger Laurence*, (a non-juring bishop), Lay-Baptism invalid, 3d ed., 1711, (1842): 2d. part, 1713; Supplement, 1714. *Brett's* Letter to the Author of Lay-Baptism, etc., 1711. *G. Bingham*, Scholastic History of Lay-Baptism, 2 vols., Lond., 1712. Bp. *W. Fleetwood* (bp. of Ely), Judgment of Church of England in case of Lay-Baptism, with Letter to Bp. Cosin, Lond., 1712; anonymously published; such baptism not declared invalid by the church. *Waterland*, on Lay-Baptism, Works, vol. x., ed. of 1828. The Jacobites were most strenuous on this matter. A noted couplet reads:

> For that schismatic Primate and Hollander King,
> Are still in want of a christening:

the primate was *Tillotson*, who was not baptised in the Anglican communion; and the King was William III., who had only received "Dutch baptism."]

In respect to those who could rightfully administer baptism, all the communions that had a regular order of priests or teachers, assigned baptism to them. Cat. Rom. Qu. 18. Conf. Helv. c. 20.

Jealous as is the Roman Catholic Church in other respects as to the rights of the priestly order, it here concedes an exception, because assuming the absolute necessity of infant baptism. In the absence of the priest, in cases of extreme necessity, laymen, and if there be no male, then women, nurses, may perform the rite: Cat. Rom., Qu. 19. The Reformed Church declares against this in the most definite manner. Conf. Helv., c. 20: Docemus baptismum in ecclesia non administrari debere a mulierculis vel obstetricibus. Paulus enim removit mulierculis ab officiis ecclesiasticis. Baptismus autem pertinet ad officia ecclesiastica. [Presb. Directory of Worship, ch. viii.: Baptism is not to be admin-

istered, in any case, by any private person, but a minister of Christ, called to be the steward of the mysteries of God."]—In practice the Zwinglian Reformed Church is farthest from the Catholic, denying not only the so-called baptism in cases of necessity, but also the baptism in emergency (*Nothtaufe*), which is customary in the Lutheran Church, and in the less strict Reformed churches. The same holds of baptism in the house. [Presb. Directory, ch. vii: "There may be cases when it will be expedient to administer the ordinance in private houses; of which the minister is to be the judge."]

§ 271.

ESCHATOLOGY.

And, lastly, Protestants and Roman Catholics were in almost perfect accordance as to the doctrine of the last things[1] (with the exception of the doctrine concerning purgatory, § 263). The minor sects also adopted, in the main, the same views respecting the *second advent* of Christ to judge the world, and the resurrection of the body. As regards the *state of the blessed and the lost*, the opinions of the different denominations were modified in various ways by their respective creeds,[2] but these differences were not introduced into the symbolical books.[3] *Calvin* combated the theory called *Psychopannychy*, revived by some Swiss Anabaptists;[4] the Second Confessio Helvetica expressly rejected the idea that departed spirits re-appear on earth.[5] The fanatical notions of the Anabaptists, concerning the restitution of all things, and Millennarianism, were rejected by the Protestants.[6] Nevertheless several Protestant writers, on various occasions, revived Millennarian errors, which were also harbored by the mystics.[7] *William Petersen* and his wife,[8] misunderstanding Spener's doctrine concerning better times to come, and the realization of God's kingdom on earth,[9] announced the speedy approach of the Millennial reign.

[1] Protestant theologians generally enumerate the following four particulars as constituting what is called the last things: mors, resurrectio, extremum judicium, and consummatio mundi: some, however, adopt other modes of reckoning. Comp. *De Wette*, p. 207.

[2] On the views about heaven as held, *e. g.*, by Lutherans and Reformed, see *Schneckenburger*, Ueber den doppelten Stand Christi, p. 115.

[3] Conf. Aug. Art. 17 (p. 14): Item docent, quod Christus apparebit in consummatione mundi ad judicandum et mortuos omnes resuscitabit, piis et *electis* dabit vitam æternam et perpetua gaudia, impios autem homines ac diabolos condemnabit, ut sine fine crucientur (the same doctrine is set forth in the other symbolical books).—At a later period theologians endeavored (in the spirit of the scholastics) to define the distinction between the happiness which the soul will enjoy *without* the body, and that of which it will partake after the resurrection of the body. The general judgment at the end of the world was also distinguished from the judicium extremum particulare et occultum, which takes place after the death of each individual.

[4] He wrote: Traité par le quel est prouvé, que les âmes veillent et vivent aprés qu'elles sont sorties des corps, Orléans, 1534. It was also translated into Latin under the title: Psychopannychia, quo refellitur eorum error, qui animos post mortem usque ad ultimum judicium dormire putant. Par., 1534. Comp. *Henry's* Calvin, i. p. 63, ss.—The question started by some of the fathers, whether the soul of itself possesses immortality (vol. i. § 58) was also revived in the seventeenth century. *Henry Dodwell*, a learned high-church divine of the Church of England, in order to exalt the doctrine of baptismal grace, asserted that the soul is itself mortal, but rendered immortal by becoming connected with the Divine Spirit in baptism. None but the Episcopal church enjoys the true possession of this baptismal grace! This assertion called forth several replies. The controversy lasted principally from the year 1706 to 1708. See *Lechler*, Geschichte des englischen Deismus, p. 211, ss. [*Henry Dodwell*, b. 1641, d. 1711, Camden Prof. at Oxford, 1688, ejected for refusing the oath to William and Mary. His work was entitled: Epistolary Discourse, proving from the Scriptures and First Fathers, that the soul is a principle naturally mortal, but immortalized, actually by the pleasure of God, to punishment, or to reward, by its union with the divine baptismal Spirit. Wherein is proved that none have the power of giving this immortalizing spirit since the Apostles, but only the Bishops, Lond., 1706. Among the replies were works by *Samuel Clarke*, A Letter to Mr. Dodwell (Works, iii.); *Edmund Churchill*, Charge of Heresy against Dodwell, 1706; *Richard Baxter; Daniel Whitby*, Reflections, etc., 1707. See Dodwell's Life by Francis Brokesby, 2 vols., 1715, 1723.—*William Coward*, M. D., in his Second Thoughts concerning the Human Soul, by Estibius Psychalettres, 1702, 2d ed., 1704, defended Materialism: replies by Dr. *John Broughton*, Psycholegia; *John Turner*, Vindication, etc., 1703. His work was burnt by the common hangman, by order of Parliament, 1704.] Comp. *Baumgarten*, Geschichte der Religionsparteien, p. 71.

[5] Art. 26 (in reference to the doctrine of purgatory): Jam quod traditur de spiritibus vel animabus mortuorum apparentibus aliquando viventibus, et petentibus ab eis officia, quibus liberentur, deputamus apparitiones eas inter ludibria, artes et deceptiones diaboli, qui, ut potest se transfigurare in angelum lucis, ita satagit fidem veram vel evertere, vel in dubium revocare. (Deut. xviii. 10, 11; Luc. xvi. 31.)

[6] Conf. Aug. l. c.: Damnant Anabaptistas, qui sentiunt, hominibus damnatis ac diabolis finem pœnarum futuram esse. Damnant et alios, qui nunc spargunt judaicas, opiniones, quod ante resurrectionem mortuorum, pii regnum mundi occupaturi sint, ubique oppressis impiis.

[7] *Valentin Weigel*, *Jacob Böhme*, *Felgenhauer*, *Drabicius*, *Quirinus Kuhlmann*, etc. Comp. *Corrodi*, Geschichte des Chiliasmus, and *Adelung*, Geschichte der menschlichen Narrheit.

[8] *John William Petersen* (was from the year 1688 superintendent in Lüneburg, dismissed 1692, and died 1727 on his estate Thymern, near Zerbst), published from 1700–1710 his Mysterium Apocatastaseos, in which the common millennarian doctrine (concerning a twofold resurrection, and Christ's visible kingdom on earth, which will last a thousand years) was

connected with Origen's notion of the restitution of all things.* His wife, *Johanna Eleonora von Merlau*, agreed with him in all points; both boasted of having received particular revelations from God. See Petersen's Autobiography, 1717. *Corrodi*, iii. 2, p. 133, ss. *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. nach der Reformat. viii. p. 302, ss.

[9] *Spener*, firmly believing in the final victory of Christianity, entertained "*the hope of better times.*" Previous to the general judgment the Jews will be converted, and Papacy overthrown. But in his opinion this glorious state does not abrogate the kingdom of grace, nor will it manifest itself in a secular manner. He did not venture to determine anything respecting the exact period of time (the period of a thousand years). "*But his opponents found no difficulty in drawing invidious inferences from the moderate hopes of Spener;*" *Schröckh*, viii. p. 282.—The views of *Joachim Lange*, concerning the Revelation of John, were more literal than those of his master; see *Corrodi*, iii. 1, p. 108, ss.

* He also held the idea of Christ's heavenly (divine) humanity, referred to in § 266, note 7.

FIFTH PERIOD.

FROM THE YEAR 1720 TO THE PRESENT DAY.

THE AGE OF CRITICISM, OF SPECULATION, AND OF THE ANTAGONISM BETWEEN FAITH AND KNOWLEDGE, PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIANITY, REASON AND REVELATION, AND OF ATTEMPTS TO RECONCILE THESE ANTAGONISMS.

A. GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FIFTH PERIOD.

§ 272.

INTRODUCTION.

J. A. Von Einem, Versuch einer Geschichte des 18 Jahrhunderts. Leipz., 1776 ss *Schlegel*, Kirchengeschichte des 18 Jahrhunderts, Heilbr., 1784 ss., ii., continued by *Fraas*. *Schlosser*, Geschichte des 18 und 19 Jahrhunderts. Heidelberg, 1836 ss., 2d vol. to the year 1763. [5 vols. to 1797; 3d ed., 1843; transl. by Davidson, Lond. 6 vols., 1846.] *J. K. L. Gieseler*, Kirchengesch. d. neusten Zeit, von 1814 bis auf die Gegenwart, Bonn, 1845 [to be comprised in vol. v. of the New York translation of Gieseler. *Hagenbach*, Kirchengesch. des 18th und 19th Jahr., 2 Bde., 1848. *Neudecker*, Geschichte des evang. Protest. in Deutschland, 2 Thle. Lpz., 1845.] Comp. the literature in *Hase's* Church Hist., New York translation, p. 483, and in *Niedner*, Kirchengeschichte, s. 795. [Comp. the general histories of *Alison*, *De Koch*, *Raumer*, *Heeren* und *Ukert's*, Staatsgeschichten, etc. *C. L. Michelet*, Gesch. der Menscheit in ihrem Entwick'ungsgange seit 1775 bis auf die neuesten Zeiten. 2 Bde., Berl., 1860. *G. G. Gervinus*, Geschichte des 19. Jahr. seit d. Weiner Verträgen, 4 Bde., 1859.]

J. K. L. Gieseler, Rückblick auf die theologische und kirchliche Entwicklung der letzen 50 Jahre., Gött., 1837 (kritische Prediger-Bibliothek, xviii., part 5, p. 908 ss.) On the other side: *Tholuck*, Abriss und Geschichte der Umwälzung, welche seit 1750 auf dem Gebiet der Theologie in Deutschland stattgefunden, in the Berliner evangelische Kirchenzeitung, Dec. 1830 (see his Vermischte Schriften, vol. 2.) [*Tholuck's* History of Theology in the Eighteenth Century, in Theol. Essays from Princeton Re-

view. New York, 1846, pp. 524–608. *Leonard Wood*, in Preface to translation of Knapp's Theology, 1831. *E. B. Pusey*, An Historical Inquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalistic Character lately predominant in the Theology of Germany. To which is prefixed a letter from *Prof. Sack* on Rev. J. H. Rose's Discourses on German Protestantism, Lond., 1828; Part 2. An Explanation of the Views misconceived by Mr. Rose, 1830.] *Neander*, Das verflossene halbe Jahrhundert, in Zeitschrift f. christl. Wissenschaft, 1 Jahrg., p. 215 sq. The Anti-Rationalistic Literature from the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century, in *Tholuck's* Anzeiger, 1836, No. 15–18. *K. F. A. Kahnis*, Der innere Gang des deutschen Protestantismus seit Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts, Leipz., 1854 [translated by *Mayer*, Edinb. 1856; 2d ed. of original, 1860]. *Karl Schwarz*, Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie, Leipz., 1836, 2te Aufl., 1857. [*Wangemann*, Sieben Bücher Preussischer Kirchengesh.; Kampf um die lutherische Kirche im 19. Jahrh. 2 Bde., Berl., 1858. *Jas. Edm. Jörg*, (Rom. Cath.) Gesch. des Protestantismus in seiner neuesten Entwicklung, 2 Bde., Freiburg, 1858. *Gregoire*, Historie des Sectes religieuses depuis le Commencement du Siècle dernier, 5 vols., Paris, 1828. *Henrion*, Historie générale de l'eglise pendant les 18 et 19 Siècles, Paris, 1836. E. H. Dewar, Hist. Germ. Protest., Oxf., 1844.]

The spirit of investigation having been awakened, and the belief in human authority shaken, by the Reformation of the sixteenth century, a more liberal and progressive movement was inaugurated. But as the Reformers, at the same time, declared, in the most decided terms, that no other foundation can be laid than that which is laid in Christ, and strengthened the belief in the divine authority of Scripture, they of course also directed the attention of Christians to the early history of the Christian Church. Neither of these two points should be overlooked, if we would form a correct judgment of Protestantism, and its importance in history. During the second half of the sixteenth, and the whole of the seventeenth century, most theologians had lost sight of its true significance as regards the former aspect, by again submitting to the yoke of human authority, and thus preventing all progress. The very opposite tendency characterizes the eighteenth century. Theologians and philosophers, animated by an ardent desire after enlightenment and spiritual liberty, gradually renounced their allegiance to the only foundation on which the Reformers had thought it safe to build, and for which, no less than for liberty, the martyrs of the Protestant Church had shed their blood. The authority of Holy Writ was by degrees impaired, together with that of the symbolical books, and not long after, *those* doctrines which the earlier Protestants, as well as Roman Catholics, had rejected, as opposed to Christianity, became prevalent in various sections of the Church. But, as in the seventeenth century there were not wanting excitable and free-thinking spirits, though the majority were stable, so, too, in the midst of the contests and storms of recent times, there were found men of a conservative tendency; and attempts were made to restore what had been destroyed, and to bring about a reconciliation between the two extremes. It is the task of the history of doctrines during this last period, to represent this remarkable struggle in all its details, and to treat of its elements

separately, as well as in their relation to each other. This delineation, in its historical aspect, is nearly identical with the course of recent church history; as to its substance, it leads directly into the sphere of dogmatic theology the nearer it approaches the present times.

["The Reformation, from its very commencement, included a double interest, viz, that of universal reason as well as the specifically religious. In the consciousness of its freedom, the subjective spirit, moved by the pressure of the need of salvation, emancipated itself from everything which was in irreconcilable opposition to the religious consciousness. The freedom of Scriptural interpretation had again became limited by the dogmatic pressure of the confessions of faith.... A conflict must ensue with a domineering system, which did not allow the freedom of the individual. But the relation was different so far as this, that the principle of self-emancipation was not now to be battled for; what had been already gained was to be grasped in its full significancy, and carried out to its practical and valid results." *Baur*, Dogmengeschichte, 343–4.]

§ 273.

INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY UPON THEOLOGY.

An invincible testimony to the essential practical efficiency of Christianity is given in the fact, that it owed neither its origin, nor the restoration of purer principles, to a system of philosophy.[1] At the same time, its more profound speculative import, and high importance in a philosophical point of view, are clearly proved by the fact, that philosophy has always put itself into either hostile or friendly relations with theology, endeavoring either to destroy it, or to interweave it with its own speculations and dialectics.[2] The grand attempt made by the scholastics appeared at first successful. But after its degeneracy into the vain subtilties of the schools had brought philosophy into disrepute among evangelical Christians, the Protestant Church, which sprung up in opposition to this scholasticism, kept aloof for a long time from the speculations of philosophers, entrenched in its strict systematic theology.[3] Yet it must also be admitted, that Protestantism itself awakened modern philosophy, and furthered its development.

[1] Comp. vol. i., § 17, and vol. ii., § 211.

[2] It is sufficient to refer to the phenomena of Neoplatonism, Gnosticism, and the philosophy of the school of Alexandria during the first period, and to the scholasticism of the third period.

[3] Comp. § 238.

§ 274.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF WOLF.

* *Wuttke, H.*, Christian Wolfi's eigene Lebensbeschreibung, Leipz., 1841. *Ludovici*, Entwurf einer Historie der Wolfischen Philosophie, Leipz., 1737, iii. *Niedner*, Kirchengeschichte, 755 sq. [*Pusey*, ubi supra. *Feuerbach*, Darstellung d. Leibnitzschen Phil., 1837. *Kuno Fischer*, Geschichte der neueren Phil., Bd. 2, 1855.]

It was not until the philosophy of Leibnitz (in the modified form in which it was presented by *Christian Wolf*),[1] had obtained more general authority, that it extended its influence also to theology, as the Leibnitz-Wolfian system. The attempt to establish a system of natural religion, on the principle of demonstration (independently of revelation, but not in direct opposition to it),[2] met with a very different reception among the various parties of the church. One class of theologians, the pietists in particular, were not only hostile to such innovations, but also persecuted their advocates.[3] On the contrary, the adherents of that moderate and rational form of orthodoxy which, towards the commencement of the eighteenth century, was represented by some able and learned men,[4] hastened to adopt the demonstrative method, thinking that they might make use of natural theology as a convenient stepping-stone for revealed religion, and thus gain a solid foundation for the truths of the latter.[5]

[1] *Wolf* was born A. D. 1679, in Breslau, appointed professor of mathematics in the University of Halle (1707), dismissed from office by the order of King Frederic William I. (1723), banished (upon pain of death), lived some time in Cassel and Marburg, was recalled (1740) by King Frederic II., appointed Chancellor, and died 1754.

[2] Among Wolf's works are: Vernünftige Gedanken von Gott, der Welt und der Seele des Menschen, auch allen Dingen überhaupt, 1719. Anmerkungen über die vernünftingen Gedanken, etc. Theologia Naturalis, 1736, etc.

[3] One of the principal opponents of Wolf was *Joachim Lange* (born 1670, died 1744, as a professor in the University of Halle.) He wrote: Causa Dei et Religionis adversus Naturalismum, Atheïsmum, Judæos, Socinianos et Pontificios, Hal., 1726, 27, iii. 8vo, and several other treatises. On the progress of the controversy, and the writings to which it gave rise, see the work of *Wuttke* mentioned above (in which many statements made by previous writers are corrected). Several other writers joined Lange in combating the principles propounded by Wolf, *e. g. Francke*, *M. Daniel Strähler*, etc. *Valentine Löscher* (died 1749), and *John Francis Buddeus* of Jena (he wrote: Bedenken über Wolf's Philosophie, 1724,) as well as the University of Upsal, in Sweden, pronounced against him, not to mention the

Roman Catholics, headed by the Jesuits; though some of the latter made use of the philosophy of Wolf in their own schools.*

[4] Previous to the time of Wolf, *Pufendorf* had proposed to apply the mathematico-demonstrative method of argumentation to Christian theology, expecting to derive great advantage from such a treatment. See his Epistola ad Fratrem, in Actorum Erudit. Lips. supplem. Tom. ii. Sect. 2, p. 98; *Heinrich*, p. 438. About the time of the rise of the Wolfian philosophy several other theologians had commenced (apart from what was done by Pufendorf) to treat systematic theology in a more liberal spirit, and less dependent upon traditional authorities. This shows that Wolf, though in a stricter method, acted in accordance with the spirit of the age. Among these theologians were: *Christian Matthew Pfaff* (born 1686, died 1760): Institutiones Theologiæ Dogmat. et Moral., Tub., 1720; even *J. F. Buddeus* (born 1667, died 1729), despite his opposition to Wolf (see the previous section), in his Institutiones Theologiæ dogmat. Lips., 1723, '24, '27, '41, 4to. *Christian Eberhard Weissmann* (born 1677, died 1747): Institutiones Theologiæ exegetico-dogmaticæ. Tub. 1739, 4to. *J. Lorenz von Mosheim* (born 1694, died 1755): Elementa Theologiæ Dogmat., edited by *Windheim*, Norimb., 1758, 8.—In the Reformed Church, in addition to *J. A. Turretine* and *Samuel Werenfels* (comp. § 225), *J. F. Osterwald*, pastor of Neufchatel (born 1633, died 1747), contributed most to the transition to a new state of things. His Compendium Theologiæ, Basil., 1639, 8, remained for a considerable time the text-book of theology for the Swiss Calvinists. [Transl. into English by Rev. John McMains, Glasgow, 1737; a Hartford (N. E.) edition, 1786.]

[5] Among the Lutheran theologians who adopted the method of Wolf, were: *Jacob Carpov* (professor of mathematics in Weimar, born 1699, died 1768): Œconomia Salutis Novi Test. sive Theologia Revel. dogmatica methodo scientifica adornata, Vimar., 1737–65, iv. 4. *John Gustavus Reinbeck* (born 1682, died 1741, as an ecclesiastical counsellor in Berlin; he enjoyed great reputation as a preacher): Betrachtungen über die in der Augsb. Conf. enthaltenen und damit verknüpften göttlichen Wahrheiten, 1731–41, iv. 4.† *G. H. Ribow* (born 1703, died 1774): Institut. Theol. Dogm. methodo demonstrativa traditæ, Gött., 1740, 41. *Israel Gottlieb Canz* (born 1690, died 1753): Compend. Theol. purioris, Tüb., 1752.‡

* The danger which many apprehended from the spread of the Wolfian philosophy, was not a mere fancy. "*It cannot well be said that the philosophy of Wolf endangered orthodox theology in a direct manner: on the contrary, we find that many of the followers of Wolf either adopted the principle of indifferentism as to positive religion, or formally confirmed it. But the distinction introduced by Wolf between natural and revealed religion, i. e. between religion which may be proved by demonstration, and religion which must be received by faith, prepared the way for the ascendency of the deistic principle of natural religion over the principles of revealed religion:*" *Lechler*, Geschichte des Deismus, p. 448. Comp. *Tholuck*, l. c., p. 10–23. *Saintes-Ficker* (see the literature of the next section), p. 54 sq.

† Immediately after the publication of the first volume of this work, the opponents of Wolf expressed their belief that its author was either a Socinian or a deist, who neither would nor could discuss the doctrine concerning Christ. But their suspicions were unfounded. See *Heinrich*, p. 444.

‡ He also wrote: Philosophiæ Leibnitzianæ et Wolfianæ Usus in Theologia per præcipua Fidei Capita, Lips., 1749. (This work enjoyed at the time a great celebrity.)

Peter Reusch (born 1693, died 1757): Introductio in Theol. revelatam. *J. E. Schubert* (born 1717, died 1774): Introductio in Theol. rev. Jen., 1749, 8, and Institutiones theol. dogm., 1749, 1753, 8. *Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten* (born 1705, died 1757): Theses. Theol. seu Elementa Doctrinæ sanctioris ad Duct. Breviarii *J. A. Freylinghausen*, Hal., 1746, '50, '67, 8vo.—Evangelische Glaubenslehre mit Einleitung von *Semler*, Halle, 1759, '60, iii. 4. On the great influence which Baumgarten exerted upon his age, see *Tholuck*, ii. p. 12.—Several Calvinistic theologians also followed the method of Wolf, more or less closely, such as *Daniel Wyttenbach* of Berne (born 1706, died 1779, as a professor in Marburg): Tentamen Theol. Dogm. Methodo scientifica pertractatæ, Bern., 1741, 42, iii. 8. Francof. a. M., 1747, iv. 8. *John Frederic Stupfer*, of Berne (died 1775): Institutiones Theol. Polemicæ, Tur., 1743–47, v. 8. Grundlegung zur wahren Relig. (a popular treatise), Zür., 1746–53, xii. 8. *J. Chr. Beck*, of Basle (born 1711, died 1785): Fundamenta Theol. Naturalis et Revelatæ, Bas., 1757. (Comp. the Prolegomena to this work; in which the author expressly recommends the handling of natural religion as preparatory to that of revealed religion, pp. 25, 26); Synopsis Institutionum universæ theologiæ, 1765; and *Samuel Endemann* (born 1727, died 1789, as a professor in Marburg): Institutiones Theol. Dogmat. T. I. II., Hanov., 1777, 8.

§ 275.

INFLUENCE OF DEISM AND NATURALISM. RATIONALIZING ATTEMPTS.

Lerminier, De l'Influence de la Philosophie du 18° Siècle, Paris, 1833, Leipz., 1835. *Villemain*, Cours de Littérature Française; Tableau du 18° Siècle, Paris, 1838, Tom. ii. p. 222, ss. *Henke*, Kirchengeschichte, vol. vi. edited by *Vater*. *Stäudlin*, Geschichte des Rationalismus und Supranaturalismus, Gött., 1826, p. 119, ss. *Amand Saintes*, Histoire Critique du rationalisme en Allemagne, Paris et Leips., 1841; in German by *C. G. Ficker*, Lpz., 1847. **Schlosser*, Geschichte des 18 Jahrhunderts, vol. i. p. 447; ii. p. 443, ss. *Hagenbach*, Gesch. des 18 und 19 Jahrb. 2te Ausg., Lpz., 1848. Comp. § 238. [*Pusey*, ubi supra. *John Leland*, Deistical Writers, 2, 1754, new ed. 1837. *G. V. Leckler*, Gesch. des englischen Deismus, Stuttg., 1851. *W. Van Mildert*, Rise and Progress of Infidelity (Boyle Lectures, 1802–4), 2 vols., Oxf., 1838. *Mark Pattison*, Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, in Essays and Reviews, 1860, pp. 279–362.]

While natural religion and theology, in a strict and sometimes pedantic scientific form, was thus in Germany retained within its proper limits, and made honorably subservient to revelation, the principles of Deism and Naturalism, developed in the preceding period, gained numerous adherents in England and France,[1] and soon threatened to make their appearance also in Germany.[2] During the second half of the eighteenth century, the most powerful attacks upon positive Christianity were made by the anonymous author of the *Wolfenbüttelsche Fragmente* (*i. e.* fragments of Wolfenbüttel),[3] which gave rise to fundamental controversies as to the

rights of reason in matters of faith.[4] The spirit of the age, influenced as it was by *Frederic the Great*, King of Prussia,[5] also contributed to the spread of deistic tendencies, especially among the higher classes. Not only the heroes of literature, during the eighteenth century,[6] but some ministers of the church, endeavored gradually to introduce such principles among the educated, and even among the people.[7] ["The more earnest character of English Deism at length passed over, even among the deists themselves, into the shallow frivolities of French naturalism, materialism, and atheism, and into the destructive tendencies of Voltaire and the Encyclopedists, whose influence reached Germany. The Wolfenbüttel Fragments were the German product of the energetic character of English Deism; and in these and kindred controversies, carried on by *Lessing*, with all the power of his soul, the German mind already showed, that it was able to grapple with the boldest doubts, and that it could assume no other than a critical relation to the contents of revelation." *Baur*, p. 347.]

[1] Comp. § 238, and *Lechler's* Geschichte des Deismus. To the number of those English deists (some of whom, as *Woolston*, *Tindal*, and *Chubb*, come over into the present period), whose names have been already mentioned, may be added Viscount *Bolingbroke* and *David Hume*. [*Henry St. John*, *Viscount Bolingbroke*, "the last of the deists," b. 1678, Secretary of War, 1704–7, of State, 1710–15, impeached for becoming Secretary to Charles Stewart, d. 1751. Letters in the Use and Study of History, first publ. in The Craftsman, 1725. Life by *Goldsmith*, 1809; by *G. W. Cooke*, 2 vols., 1835. Warburton's Letters to Hurd, and View of Bolingbroke's Philos., 1754–5. *Leland's* Deistical Writers, i. 371 to the end, and ii. to p. 350. Works, 5, 4to, 1754; 8, 8vo, 1809; Correspondence, 2, 4to, 1798, 4, 8vo.—*David Hume*, b. 1711, d. 1787, Treatise of Human Nature, 1737; Essays, 1741; Philos. Essays, 1748 (a new edition of the Treatise); Principles of Morals, 1751; Polit. Disc., 1752; Natural Hist. of Religion, 1755; Hist. of England, 1754–62. Philosophical Works, Edinb., 4 vols., 1826, Boston, 1854. Posthumous, Dialogue concerning Natural Relig., 1779; Essays on Suicide, 1783. Comp. *Mackintosh* and *Stewart*, Diss. on Ethical Philos. prefixed to Encyc. Britan., and in their respective works; *Cousin's* Hist. of Mod. Philos., etc. *Hume's* Essays on Miracles were answered by *Geo. Campbell*, *Leland* in his Deistical Writer, *Paley*, *Douglas*, and many others. The Presb. General Assembly, 1775, condemned his writings and threatened excommunication. Life and Correspondence, edited by *T. H. Burton*, 2, 8vo., Edinb., 1847.] Bolingbroke may be said to form the transition to the frivolous naturalism and gross materialism of the French philosophers, whose principles were set forth in the Système de la Nature (1740), in the works of *Condillac* (died 1780), *La Mettrie* (died 1751), *Helvetius* (died 1771), *Voltaire* (died 1778), and in those of the so called Encyclopedists (Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire Universel, etc., 1751), *d'Alembert* (died 1783), and *Diderot* (died 1784). *Jean Jacques Rousseau* (died 1778:—

Emile, ou Confessions d'un Vicaire Savoyen) differed from these as to his personal character and tendency, but was also opposed to positive religion. —For a comparison instituted between the English and French deists, see *Henke*, l. c. § 10. At all events, the more profound English philosophers exerted a far more considerable influence upon the learned men of Germany, than the Frenchmen, whose writings met with greater success among the laymen. Only the Protestant Rousseau awakened German sympathies. Comp. *Tholuck*, ii. p. 33.

[2] It is a remarkable circumstance, which, however, admits of a satisfactory explanation, that even some of the German mystics adopted deistic principles, *e. g. John Conrad Dippel*, surnamed the Christian Democritus (died 1734), and *J. Chr. Edelmann* (born 1698, died 1767). The latter, after having been for a short time connected with the Illuminati, followed in the steps of *Knutzen* (comp. *Henke*, § 23, 6). Concerning the history of his life, and his work (Moses mit aufgedecktem Angesicht, Freib., 1740, ii. 8), see *J. H. Pratje*, Historische Nachricht von Edelmann, Hamb., 1785, and *W. Elster*, Erinnerungen an J. C. Edelmann, Clausth., 1839.—*Chr. Tob. Damm* (born 1699, died 1778), a philologist, wrote (1765) a work upon the New Testament (under royal sanction), founded on deistic principles, and reduced the religion of Christ to mere natural religion in his works: Ueber den historischen Glauben, 1772, ii., and Ueber die Religion, 1773.—The works of the English deists were also translated into German, and welcomed with eagerness by numbers. See the Bekenntnisse of *Lavkhard*, quoted by *Lechler*, p. 451; *Tholuck*, ii. p. 31. A catalogue of the most important deistic writings is given by *Baumgarten*, Geschichte der Religionsparteien, p. 129.

[3] *G. E. Lessing* published a series of treatises, containing essays and notices, under the title: "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Litteratur, aus den Schätzen der herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel." The third of these treatises appeared 1774, under the title: Fragment eines Ungenannten, von Duldung der Deisten. (A fragment concerning the toleration of the deists, composed by an anonymous writer.) The fourth treatise, which was published 1777, contained five "fragmente"—viz. 1. Von der Verschreiung der Vernunft auf den Kanzeln. (Concerning the denunciation of reason from the pulpit.) 2. Unmöglichkeit einer Offenbarung, die alle Menschen auf eine gegründete Art glauben könnten. (The impossibility of a revelation on which all men can found a reasonable belief.) 3. Durchgang der Israëliten durchs rothe Meer. (The passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea.) 4. Dass die Bücher des Alten Testaments nicht geschrieben worden, eine Religion zu offenbaren. (A proof that the Old Test. Scriptures were not written in order to reveal a particular religion.) 5. Ueber die Auferstehungsgeschichte. (Concerning the history of Christ's resurrection.) Last of all was published (1778) the boldest work: Von dem Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger, noch ein Fragment des Wolfenbüttler Ungenannten. (Concerning the object of Christ and his disciples, another fragment published by the anonymous Wolfenbüttel writer.) After Lessing's death, *C. A. E. Schmidt* (who was said to be a layman) published other works by that anonymous writer (they referred for the most part to the Old Test.). It is

now decided that Lessing was not the author of these works. They are generally ascribed to *H. S. Reimarus* (born 1694 in Hamburgh, died 1768, who wrote a system of natural religion.) For further particulars as to the authorship, see *Illgen's* historische Zeitschrift, 1839, part 4, p. 97, ss. In reply *Lachmann*, in vol. xii. of Lessing's works: *Guhrauer*, Bodin's Heptaplomeres, Berlin, 1841, p. 257, *sq.*

[4] Controversy between Lessing and Götze, pastor primarius in Hamburg. —Nathan der Weise (1679.)—He further published Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts, 1780: on the question, whether this was on the basis of a work by *Thœr*, see *Illgen's* Zeitschrift, 1839.—In the year 1784, appeared his: Theologischer Nachlass (Posthumous writings.) As regards the relation in which Lessing stood to Christianity, see *Twesten*, Dogmatik, i p. 19. *Röhr*, kleine theologische Schriften, 1841, p. 158, ss. *Karl Schwarz*, Lessing als Theologe, Halle, 1854. [His Education of the Human Race is translated in part, in *Hedge's* Prose Writers of Germany, Phil., 1858, pp. 91–5. On Nathan the Wise, see *Jeffrey*, in Edinb. Review, vol. 8. Retrospective Review, 10.] *Wackernagel*, Lessing's Nathan der Weise, in Gelzer's Mon. Bl. vi. 4. [*A. W. Bohtz*, Protestantismus und Nathan der Weise, Götting., 1854.]

[5] On the stay which *Voltaire* made at the Prussian court, and the literary labors of Frederic II., see *A. F. Büsching*, Character Friedrich II., Halle, 1788. *Preuss*, Friedrich der Grosse. 5. voll. Berlin, 1833, 34.

[6] "The '*Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek*,' *edited by Nicolai, which during the first period of its existence* (*it was founded* 1765) *enjoyed unlimited authority in the literary world, combated the received faith of the church in an insidious, hypocritical manner, and denounced everything which was above its own prosaic views of religion and morals, as superstition or Jesuitism*;" *Hase*, Church History, p. 539. Deistic tendencies were furthered and spread in families, as well as in schools, by the Philanthropinism of *Basedow* (born 1723, died 1790); *Salzmann* (born 1744, died 1811); and *Campe* (born 1746, died 1818). On Basedow's work, Philalethie, Altona, 1764, see *Heinrich*, p. 467, ss. Among the people the interest for systematic theology had considerably diminished. A calculating system of expediency deprived life of all its poetry, and reduced religion to a mere code of morals, useful for our civil duties. Among the pious part of the people, *C. F. Gillert* (1715–69) continued to enjoy great authority; his views of Christianity, though didactic and prolix, were distinguished by depth of feeling. Nor had *Klopstock's* Messiah (1748), which had once been received with eagerness, fallen into oblivion. On the other hand, the works of *Wieland* contributed to the spread of a refined freethinking, as well as of French frivolity, among the German people. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Compendium i. p. 445, note k, shows with great acuteness the connection existing between that sentimentality, which was intended to serve as a substitute for true religious feelings, and deistic tendencies. (On Lessing, see above, note 4; on Herder, compare § 281.)—Some attempts were also made to form societies on the basis of deistic principles. Such were the "Illuminati" founded by *Weishaupt*, in the year 1777: the "Freunde der Aufklärung" (friends of enlightenment) in Berlin, 1783; see *Tholuck's* literarischer Anzeiger, 1830,

No. 8; and *Bahrdt's* Gesellschaft der XXII. (Bahrdt's Society of the XXII.), comp. *Tholuck's* vermischte Schriften, ii. p. 115.

[7] The most conspicuous among them was *C. F. Bahrdt* (born 1741, died 1792); comp. his Autobiography, Berlin, 1790, ss. In his work, Versuch eines biblischen Systems der Dogmatik, Gotha und Leipzig, 1769, 70, Frankf. und Leipz., 1771, 2 voll. (see *Heinrich*, p. 469, ss.), he appeared to side with the advocates of orthodoxy: but in his writings, composed in a later period of his life, such as his Glaubensbekenntniss (1770.—Confession of faith), his Briefe über die Bibel im Volkston (1782.—Popular letters on the Bible), his Plan und Zweck Jesu (1784.—The plan and object of Christ), and some others, he endeavored to undermine all positive religion.—Several other theological writers of the present age contributed to the spread of Deism, or, at least, of indifference in religious matters, and of a superficial rationalism, e. g. *J. A. Eberhard* (formerly pastor in Charlottenburg, afterwards a professor of theology in Halle, died 1809), who wrote the Neue Apologie des Socrates, ii. vol., Berlin, 1776, 78; *G. S. Steinbart* (professor of theology in Francfort on the Oder, died 1809), Eudämonistisches System der reinen Philosophie, oder Glückseligkeitslehre des Christenthums, für die Bedürfnisse seiner aufgeklärten Landsleute und Anderer, die nach Weisheit fragen, eingerichtet, Züll., 1778, 80, 86, comp. *Heinrich*, p. 488, ss.); *W. A. Teller* (prebendary in Berlin, died 1804), who in his Dictionary (first published in Berlin, 1772), tried to correct traditional notions, partly with good sense, but in part in a superficial vein.—Several diluted and tame translations of the Bible also helped forward this alleged illumination; these had a worthy forerunner in the somewhat older Wertheim version of 1735. Sermons on nature, and morality, and agriculture, and the cow-pox, showing a total lack of understanding about the object of Christian worship, and Christian festivals, helped on the matter; as did also Dietrich's and Teller's so-called improvements in hymn-books, which only made them worse. And all this was to illustrate the utility of the office of the preacher!

§ 276.

EFFORTS OF APOLOGETICAL WRITERS. CHANGES IN THE MODE OF TREATING THEOLOGY. MODERN COMPENDIUMS OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

The attacks of the Deists gave rise to numerous refutations and Antideistica.[1] But it soon became evident that the advocates of positive Christianity were not agreed as to the best mode of operation; in the general obscurity it was found increasingly difficult to distinguish friends from foes.[2] Many of the best and ablest men willingly abandoned what they considered the mere outworks, in order to save the citadel itself; nor was it without some reason that they expected to advance the cause of the "religion of Jesus," thus fallen into disrepute among the educated, by presenting its truths in a clearer and more tasteful form, and by adapting them

to the wants of the age.[3] It was generally admitted that the old state of things could not continue; from the commencement of the eighteenth century theologians exerted themselves to give a new impulse to their science. The critical examination of the Bible was promoted by more correct information concerning the East, and more profound classical studies; the history of the Scripture-text was cleared up by the critical investigations of *Mill*, *Wettstein*, *Bengel*, and others,[4] and the history of the Canon made the subject of new researches. In this respect the labors of *Michaelis*,[5] *Ernesti*,[1] and *Semler*,[7] may be said to introduce a new period. Chiefly in consequence of the labors of *Mosheim*, church history ceased to be merely the servant of party purposes; he gave the example of a firm adherence to orthodoxy, united with impartiality in judging of heretical doctrines.[8] Thus, the works on systematic theology composed by *J. D. Michaelis*,[9] *J. D. Heilmann*,[10] *G. T. Zachariæ*,[11] *G. F. Seiler*,[12] *J. Ch. Doederlein*,[13] *S. F. N. Morus*,[14] and others, bore the impression of such progress, while their authors still endeavoured to preserve, as far as possible, the purity of evangelical doctrine. As regards this last point, the principles of *W. A. Teller*,[15] *E. J. Danov*,[16] *J. F. Gruner*,[17] *J. C. R. Eckermann*,[18] and *C. Ph. Henke*,[19] were less rigid: in their writings they manifested a growing desire to adopt neological tendencies. Among the theologians of the Reformed Church, *Stosch*,[20] continued a faithful advocate of the former system of orthodoxy, while *Mursinna*[21] gave in his adhesion with some caveats, to the modern illumination.

[1] Among the followers of Wolf, *Stiebritz*, professor of philosophy in Halle, in opposition to the deists, and in defence of the principles of his master, wrote his: "Beweis für die Wirklichkeit einer Offenbarung wider die Naturalisten, nebst einer Widerlegung derer, welche dem Wolfischen System eine Beförderung der Naturalisterei beimessen." Halle, 1746. (*Thorschmid*, Freidenkerbibliothek, ii. p. 755 ss., *Lechler*, p. 449). After the example of *Pfaff*, chancellor in the university of Halle, (who published Akademische Reden über den Entwurf der theologiæ antideisticæ, 1759) special lectures were delivered in order to refute the deists, (see *Lechler*, u. s., *Tholuck*, Vermischte Schriften, ii. p. 25). On the apologetical writings of this period, see *Tholuck*, i., 150 ss. Among the English apologists we may ation; *Lardner* (The Credibility of the Gospel History, London, 1741–62 ii.), *Addison*, *Newton*, *Berkeley*, etc. [*Joseph Addison*, b. 1672, d. 1719: On the Evidences of the Christian Religion, 1730; Complete Works, ed. *G. W. Greene*, New York, 6 vols., 1854. *Thomas Newton*, Bishop of Bristol, b. 1704, d. 1782: works, 6 vols., 1787; Dissertation on Prophecies, 2 vols., 10th ed., Lond., 1804.—*George Berkeley*, b. 1684, d. 1753, Bishop of Cloyne: Principles of Human Knowledge, 1710; Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous, 1713; Proposal for converting Savage Americans to Christianity,

1725; The Analyst, addressed to an Infidel Mathematician [Dr. Halley], 1735; Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher, 1732; Account of his Life, and Strictures on his Works, 1776; Whole Works, 2, 4to., 1784; by *G. N. Wright*, 2 vols., 1843. His defence of Christianity against the atheist was on the basis of his idealistic philosophic theory. On him see, further, North Am. Rev., Jan., 1855; Brownson's Quarterly, i.; Christ. Exam. (*Bowen*), xxiv.; Brit. Qu. Rev., July, 1857; Christian Review, April, 1861. *Joseph Butler*, Bishop of Durham, b. 1692, d. 1752. When nineteen years of age he corresponded with Dr. Samuel Clarke on the Principles of his Demonstration of the Being of God. Fifteen Sermons preached at the Rolls Chapel, 1726; his great work, The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature, was published in 1736, and has ever since been esteemed the chief work in the deistic controversy, unanswerable on the grounds then assumed in common. His works, best ed. by Bishop Halifax, 2 vols., 1849, reprinted New York. On the numerous editions of the Analogy see, *Allibone*, Dict. of Authors, i. 314.—In England and America, the vulgar infidelity was represented by *Thos. Paine*, b. 1737, d. 1809: Common Sense, 1791; Rights of Man, 1792; Age of Reason, 1792–5. *Richard Watson*, Bishop of Llandaff, (b. 1737, d. 1816), An Apology for the Bible in a Series of Letters addressed to Thos. Paine, 2d ed., Lond., 1796. *Chs. Leslie*, (nonjuror, d. 1722), Short and Easy Method with Deists: Works, 7, 8vo., Oxf., 1832. *William Paley*, b. 1743, d. 1805: Natural Theology; View of the Evidences; Horæ Paulinæ; Moral and Political Philosophy, etc. Complete Works, 4, 8vo., Lond., 1838, and often. *Philip Skelton*, b. 1707, d. 1787; Complete Works, Lond., 6 vols., 1624 (vol. 4, Ophiomaches, or Deism Revealed, in Eight Dialogues; vol. 5, Letter to the Author of the Divine Analogy, and the Minute Philosopher). *William Warburton*, Bishop of Gloucester, b. 1698, d. 1779. Works, 12 vols., Lond., 1811; The Divine Legation of Moses (vol. 1 and 2, 5th ed., 1766; 3, 4 and 5, 4th ed., 1765; vol. 6, supplement, 1768 (the 7th and 8th Books have never been published); the tenth ed., 3 vols., 1846. On the Warburtonian controversy, see Quart. Review, vol. 2, p. 401. Julian, a Disc. on the Earthquake, etc., Lond., 1750; Principles of Nat. and Rev. Religion (Werke, vol. 9). Tracts by Warburton and a Warburtonian [Bp. Hurd], Lond., 1789. Letter from a late eminent Prelate [Warburton] and one of his Friends [Hurd], 3d ed., 1809. *Richard Hurd*, Bishop of Worcester, b. 1720, d. 1808; works, 8 vols., 8vo., Lond., 1811. Introduction to the Study of Prophecies—the Warburtonian Lectures for 1772. (In the same series are published works, chiefly on the Prophecies, by *Samuel Halifax*, 1776; *Lewis Bagot*, 1780; *Robert Nares*, 1805; *Ed. Pearson*, 1807–11; *John Davison*, 1825, etc.) Other earlier works in this controversy, were *Bp. Conybeare's* Defence of Revealed Religion, 1732; *Delaney's* Revelation Examined, 3 vols., 1735; *Ellis's* Knowledge of Divine Things, 1743; Smith's (*Elisha*), Cure of Deism, 2 vols., 1736, etc.] Among the German apologists were, *Haller*, (Briefe über die wichtigsten Wahrheiten der Offenbarung, Bern, 1772); *Lilienthal* (gute Sache der Offenbarung, Königsb. 1750–82); *Less*, [Authenticity of the New Test., from the German, by *Robert Kingdon*, Lond., 1804]; *Nösselt*, etc. The "Wolfenbüttel Fragments" also gave rise to numerous

controversial writings (comp. the Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek, voll. 30 and 40), the best of which were composed by *Döderlein*, *Less*, *Michaelis*, *Barthels* and *Semler*.

[2] See *Skelton* [*Philip*, see previous note] offenbare Deisterei, 1756, ii. pref., quoted by *Tholuck*, i., p. 21: "Our modern apologists too frequently defend Christianity on deistic principles, and too readily represent their own articles of faith in a new dress; they expect that such a course of proceeding will be advantageous to their cause." In proof of this the example of *John Taylor* might be adduced [referring to *Taylor* of Norwich, b. 1694, d. 1762, author of the work on Original Sin, 1738, etc]. Comp. *Ernesti*, Neue theologische Bibliothek, i., p. 115. *Tholuck*, p. 30.

[3] Thus *Jerusalem*, *Spalding*, *Zollikoffer*, and others, whose honest intentions none can reasonably doubt. See *Jerusalem*, Betrachtungen über die vornehmsten Wahrheiten der Religion, 1768, ii., 5th edit., 1773–92. Second series, 2 vols., 1793. *Spalding*, *J. J.* (died 1804), Gedanken über den Werth der Gefühle im Christenthum, 1761 (1784); Ueber die Nutzbarkeit des Predigtamtes, 1775; Vertraute Briefe, die Religion betreffend, 1788. *G. J. Zollikoffer* wrote works of a homiletic and devotional character. *A. W. Sack* belonged to the same class of writers. The theory of accommodation adopted by these men is fairly estimated by *Steffens:* Was ich erlebte, i., p. 258 ss.

[4] Compare the Introductions to the New Testament. How much sacred criticism was brought into connection with neological tendencies, may be seen in the case of Wettstein; see *Hagenbach*, in Illgens Zeitschrift, 1839, part 1. But the necessity of a critical study of Scripture was no less felt by the advocates of the opposite principle, *e. g. Bengel*, who strenuously applied himself to it in the service of the Lord.

[5] *John David Michaelis* was born 1716, and died 1791. Comp. *Tholuck* i. p. 130. Of his disciples, *Eichhorn* is best known as the most eminent of the rationalistic theologians of the present period. Though Michaelis seemed for a time to have adopted the principles of unbiassed criticism and exegesis, he soon after began to adapt his views to the spirit of the age. He also endeavoured to explain the miracles of Christ in a natural manner. (Introduction to New Test., transl. from the 4th ed., by Herbert Marsh [Bp. Peterborough], 4 vols., in 6, Lond., 1802. Bp. Marsh was attacked in the British Critic, first series, iii. 601–4, iv. 46 sq., 170 sq.; also by *Dr. Randolph*, Remarks, etc., to which he replied in Letters. *Michaelis's* Commentaries on Laws of Moses, transl. by *Alex. Smith*, 4 vols., Lond., 1814: his Introd. Lectures to Sacred Books of New Test. were translated as early as 1780.]

[6] *John August Ernesti* was born 1707, and died 1781. He wrote: Institutio interpretis N. Test., Lips., 1761, ed. Ammon., 1792, 1809, 8. "*With the name of this theologian is connected the transition to more liberal principles in the interpretation of Holy Writ:*" *Klausen*, Hermeneutik, p. 291. On the merits of his work (which were not very great) see Klausen, l. c., p. 294. [Principles of Bibl. Interpretation, transl. by *C. A. Terrot*, Bp. of Scottish Episc. Chh., new ed., 1845; Elements of Interp., by *Moses Stuart*, Andov., 3d. ed., 1827.]

[7] *John Solomon Semler* was born 1725, and died 1791, as professor of theology in the university of Halle. Compare his Autobiography (which takes in also the history of his times), Halle, 1781, 82, ii. voll. It was especially Semler who, "*without forming a school of his own, may be said to have carried the torch which kindled the conflagration, the effects of which have not yet disappeared.*" *Tholuck*, ii., p. 39. Of his numerous (171) writings we mention only those which have reference to our present subject: Von freier Untersuchung des Kanons, Halle, 1771–75. Institutio ad Doctrinam Christianam liberaliter discendam, Hall., 1774. Versuch einer freien theologischen Lehrart, Hall., 1777 ss. The principal points of Semler's theology are the distinction which he made between theology and religion (ethics), and his endeavours to represent the sacred Scriptures as having a merely local and temporary character. An account of his life and writings is given by *Tholuck*, ii., p. 39–83. The history of doctrines owes its origin to Semler's introduction to Baumgarten's Compendium of systematic theology (vol. i., § 16.)

[8] See *F. Lücke*, Narratio de Joanne Laurentio Moshemio, Gött., 1837, 4. Soon after his death ecclesiastical history was, like exegesis, made subservient to the spirit of the times (*Spittler* and *Henke;* the pragmatic method adopted by *Planck.*) The history of doctrines was made use of to show the changeableness of the doctrines of Christianity.

[9] Comp Theol. Dogm., Gött., 1760, ed. 2, 1784.

[10] *Heilmann* was born 1729, and died 1764, as professor in Göttingen. He wrote: Comp. Theol. Dogm., Gött., 1761, ed. 3, 80.

[11] *Zachariae*, was born, 1729, and died 1777, as professor of theology in the university of Kiel. He wrote: Biblische Theologie, oder Untersuchung des biblischen Grundes der vornehmsten theologischen Lehren, Gött. u. Kiel, 1771–75. The last part was edited by *Vollborth*, 1786. Zachariæ understood by biblical theology: "*not that theology, the substance of which is taken from Scripture, for in this sense every theological system must be biblical, but more generally a precise definition of all the doctrines treated of in systematic theology, the correct understanding of these doctrines, in accordance with Scriptural notions, and the best proofs:*" Heinrich, p. 515, ss. This was, accordingly, the first attempt to treat *Biblical Theology*, as a separate branch of theological science, independently of systematic theology. His example was followed by *W. F. Hufnagel*, who wrote Handbuch der biblischen Theologie, Erlangen, 1785–91, *Ammon*, *De Wette*, *Baumgarten-Crusius* and others.

[12] *Seiler* was born 1733, and died 1807, as professor of theology in the university of Erlangen. He wrote: Theol. Dogm. Polem. c. comp. dogmat. Erl., 1774, ed. 3, 1789.

[13] *Döderlein* was born 1714, taught at Altorf and Jena, and died 1789, as a professor in Bützow. He wrote Institutio Theologi Christiani in capitibus religionis theoreticis nostris temporibus accommodata, ii., Alt. 1780, '82, '84, '87. In the preface to this work he expressed himself as follows (quoted by *Heinrich*, p. 493): "Theologians must not now invent new doctrines, and go beyond Scripture; *neither should they rest satisfied with the labors of their predecessors*, but define more precisely what they have said, make use

of modern explanations and new modes of representing certain doctrines, and *have a special regard to the wants of the age.* Hence they must examine those doctrines which are now most of all disputed, and define them the more carefully and deliberately. As regards their mode of argumentation, *they must also adapt themselves to the circumstances of the times*, and avoid approving of and retaining all arguments brought forward by earlier writers, which are in themselves doubtful and uncertain; they must rather avail themselves of the great advances recently made in biblical exegesis, so as to be more prudent in the selection of the arguments by which to prove particular doctrines; they must not consider their number, but their internal merit, and only choose such as are clear and conclusive," etc.

[14] *Morus* was born 1736, and died 1792, as professor of theology in the university of Leipsic. He wrote: Epitome Theologiæ Christianæ, Lips., 1789, *Heinrich*, p. 498 ss.

[15] *Teller* was born 1734, and died 1804 (compare § 275, note 7.) He wrote Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens, 1763; Religion der Volkommnern, 1792.

[16] *E. Jacob Danov* was born 1741, and died 1782, as professor of theology in the university of Jena. He wrote: Theologiæ dogmaticæ Institut., Lib. ii., Jen., 1772, 6. The Ketzeralmanach of 1781 (Bahrdt's) says of him: "He wears an outside coat like a regular divine, but under it is the uniform of a free partisan."

[17] *John Frederic Gruner* was born 1723, and died 1778, as professor of theology in the university of Halle. He wrote: Institutionum Theologiæ dogmaticæ lib. iii., Halle, 1777, 8. "*He was a man of much originality, and historical knowledge. His principal endeavour was to prove, like Semler, the later origin of the orthodox doctrines, and the many changes through which they have gone, with this difference, that Gruner, in support of his theory, had recourse to the Platonizantes, Semler to the Judaizantes.*" *Tholuck*, l. c., p. 106. Comp. *Heinrich*, p. 482. The main idea pervading the whole book is, that the principal doctrines of Christianity had been corrupted as early as the close of the first century, by the influence of the Platonic and Oriental philosophy of the Alexandrian school.

[18] *J. Caspar Rudolph Eckermann* was born 1754, and died 1836, as professor of theology in the university of Kiel. Among his works were: Compendium Theologiæ Christianæ theoret. bibl. histor., 1791; Handbuch für das systematische Studium der christlichen Glaubenslehre, 1801, 3, iv. voll.

[19] *Conrad Philip Henke* was born 1752, and died 1809, as professor of theology in the university of Helmstädt, and abbot of Michaelstein. He wrote: Lineamenta Institutt. Fidei Christ. histor. critic., Helmst., 1792, ed. 2, 95. In the preface to this work he enumerates three kinds of superstition which he must combat: 1. Christolatry; 2. Bibliolatry; 3. Onomatolatry; at the same time he speaks of Morus and Doederlein in terms expressive of high esteem.

[20] *Eberhard Henry Daniel Stosch* was born 1716, and died 1781, as professor of theology in the university of Frankfort on Oder. He wrote: Introductio in

Theologiam dogmaticam., Franc. ad Viadr. 1788; Institut. Theologiæ Dogmaticæ, ibid., 1779, 8. Comp. *Heinrich*, p. 551.

[21] *Samuel Mursinna* was born 1717, and died 1795, as professor of theology in the university of Halle. He wrote: Compendium Theologiæ Dogmaticæ, Halle, 1777, 8. Comp. *Heinrich*, p. 549: "*He made diligent use of the labors of modern theologians, as far as they have respect to a more correct definition of doctrines; nor did he overlook the opinions of earlier divines, but made mention of them, as well as stated the arguments commonly adduced in their support; nevertheless he did not always pronounce his own judgment concerning their merit, but left it to his readers to choose between the old and the new.*" *Barhdt*, in his Ketzeralmanach, calls him the "staff-quartermaster of the reformed partisan-corps."

Compendiums of systematic theology, written in a popular style, were published by *Less* (1779, 89), and *Griesbach* (1786, 89), who also endeavored to combine the old with the new.

§ 277.

REACTION. EDICT OF RELIGION. ORTHODOX PIETISM.

To oppose a barrier to the further spread of this fast-growing scepticism, was a bold enterprise, as was clearly proved by the failure of the two measures resorted to by the King of Prussia—viz., the publication of an Edict of Religion in the year 1788, and the institution of an ecclesiastical tribunal.[1] It was necessary that the opposing elements should develop their results through an internal process. The pietistic tendency of the school of Halle (originally founded by Spener, Francke, and others), had indeed in its second stadium lost much of its earlier vigor, and degenerated into a dead formalism.[2] But in opposition to the demonstrative as well as negative tendency of Rationalism, two theologians of Wirtemberg, *J. A. Bengel*,[3] and *F. Ch. Oetinger*,[4] gave a new direction to theology, by introducing into it not only positive, but also pietistic and mystical elements; *Ch. A. Crusius*,[5] followed their example. Societies for practical as well as philosophical purposes were founded,[6] in order to keep alive positive religion among the people. Thus, in the minds of many, the faith of their forefathers was preserved not only as a dead legacy, but assumed here and there, for the most part in the form of Pietism, depth and independence, in contrast with the superficial tendencies of the age.[7] ["Pietism let dogmas stand in their external form, believing that it could have religion and Christianity, if not without dogmas, yet without a system of dogmas in this particular form. By emphasizing the internal experience of religion, its subjective worth .... pietism itself made the transition to another standpoint, in which the individual (subject), not only lays claims to his own subjective rights, but is also under

the power of a principle which must carry him still further onward :" *Baur*, p. 345.]

[1] This edict was issued (July 9th) by Frederic William II., at the instigation of *Wöllner*, one of the king's counsellors; see Acten, Urkunden und Nachrichten zur neuesten Kirchengeschichte, vol. i. p. 461, ss. By another edict theological works were subjected to the censorship of persons appointed by the king. In addition, a committee (consisting of *Hermes*, *Hillmer*, and *Woltersdorf*), were appointed to visit and examine the clergy. The proceedings of this committee, the trial of pastor *Schulz*, in Gielsdorf (1791), and the titles of all the works published for and against the edict, are given in *Henke*, Beurtheilung aller Schriften, welche durch das preussische Religions-Edict veranlasst sind, Kiel, 1793. Respecting the ill success of those measures Hermes (in Halle) expressed himself as follows: " *We are looked upon as persons of consequence, nevertheless we have not yet succeeded in removing one single neological village pastor from office ; so all works against us.*" See *Tholuck*, ii. p. 126, ss.

[2] See Semler's Biography, i. p. 48, ss.—" *Many pious and otherwise respectable men who belonged to the school of Halle in the second generation, displayed a weak-minded and painful timidity.*" *Tholuck*, ii. p. 8. The conduct of the Halle pietists in the Wolfian controversy also brought the whole tendency into disrepute.

[3] *Bengel* was born 1687, was at first tutor in a monastery, then pastor, and died 1752 as a prelate and doctor of theology in Stuttgart. See *J. Ch. F. Burk*, Dr. J. A. Bengel's Leben und Wirken, Stuttgart, 1832.—His labors for the promotion of the critical knowledge of the Bible are deserving of special notice. He is well known as an advocate of Millennarianism. Concerning his doctrinal opinions, which were founded on his exegetical studies, see *Burk*, p. 353, ss. Comp. the article by *Hartmann*, in Herzog's Realencyclopädie. [*Burk's* Life of Bengel, transl. by *R. F. Walker*, Lond., 1837. His Gnomon of New Test., transl. by *A. R. Fausset*, and others, 8 vols., Edinb., 4th ed., 1860; by *C. T. Lewis* and *M. R. Vincent*, vol. i. Phil., 1860. In his work on the Apocalypse, his Ordo Temporum (1741), and his Age of the World, 1746, he assigned A. D. 1837 as the probable date of Christ's second coming.]

[4] *Oetinger* was born 1702, and died 1782, as prelate of the monastery Murrhard. He wrote : Theologia ex Idea Vitæ deducta, in 6 locos redacta, quorum quilibet 1. secundum sensum communem, 2. sec. mysteria scripturæ, 3. sec. formulas theticas nova et experimentali methodo pertractatur. Francof. et Lips., 1765, 8. In this work he endeavored to develop the entire system of faith in a dynamic and genetic method from the idea of life. In opposition to the mathematical method of Wolf he observes in the preface, p. 3 : Ordo geometricus incipit ab una aliqua idea abstracta ; ordo generativus, ut in seminibus patet, incipit a toto idque per minima explicat æquabiliter, quod nos nonnisi simulacris imperfectis imitari possumus. He therefore advises theologians to ascertain first of all the sensus communis, cujus præceptor est ipse Deus (Ps. xciv. 10) ; then to examine the doctrine of Scripture, and to rest on it the doctrine of the church. He finds fault with the

philosophy of Wolf principally because it has converted the terms, life, kingdom, spirit, etc., to which Scripture attaches a definite meaning, into mere abstract ideas, and thus originated a system of false idealism which resolves everything into mere symbolical phraseology. But at the same time he introduces much that is cabalistic, and refers to his work: Oeffentliches Denkmahl der Lehrtafel der Princessin Antonia, etc., Tub., 1763, which is of an entirely cabalistic character. There is in his writings a mixture of the mystical and speculative tendency of J. Böhme with the pietistic and practical of Spener. As regards the relation in which he stood to Swedenborg, compare the following §. Comp. the translation of his Theologia ex Idea Vitæ into German (Theologie aus der Idee des Lebens, etc.), by *Jul. Hamberger*, Stuttg., 1852; and **C. A. Auberlen*, Die Theosophie Fr. Chr. Oetinger's nach ihren Grundlagen, ein Beitrag zur Dogmengesch. und zur Gesch. der Philos., mit Vorwort von *Richard Rothe*, Tübing., 1848 [1859. Oetinger's Leben und Briefe, von *K. C. E. Ehmann*, 1859, who also published the first complete edition of O.'s Sermons, 1852. His Biblisches Wörterbuch was reviewed by *Auberlen* in the Studien und Kritiken, 1850. Oetinger's Sämmtliche Schriften, ed. Ehmann, 3 Bde. to 1860.]

[5] *Crusius* was a disciple of Bengel, and opposed to the philosophy of Wolf; he was born 1715, and died 1775 as professor of theology and philosophy in the university of Leipsic. He wrote: Opuscula philosophico-theologica, Lips., 1750. Die wahre Gestalt der Religion, 1754. Hypomnemoneumata ad Theol. propheticam, Lips., 1764–71, ii. 8. Vorstellung von dem eigentlichen schriftmäfsigen Plan des Reichs Gottes, Lpz., 1768, 8. Moral-theol., Lpz., 1772, 73. Comp. *Schröckh*, vi. p. 106, ss., vii. p. 647, viii. p. 41, and p. 108. *Buhle*, vol. v. p. 589, ss. *Reinhard*, Geständnisse, p. 68, ss. *Würtemann*, Einleitung in das Lehrbände des Herrn Dr. Crusius, Wbg., 1757. *Herzog's* Realencyclopädie, iii. 192, *sq.*

[6] Such societies were formed in Stockholm (1771), and the Hague (1785.) The Deutsche Christenthumsgesellschaft, *ohne Rücksicht auf Confessionsunterschied* (*i. e.* irrespective of denominational differences) was founded (1779) by *J. A. Urlsperger*, a Lutheran theologian. As its chief seats are named Basle, London, and Berlin; see *J. A. Urlsperger*, Beschaffenheit und Zweck einer zu errichtenden *deutschen Gesellschaft* thätiger Beförderer reiner Lehre und wahrer Gottseligkeit, Basle, 1781.

[7] See *Bretschneider*, die Grundlage des evangelischen Pietismus, Lpz., 1833. *Binder*, der Pietismus und die moderne Bildung, Stuttg., 1839. *Märklin*, Darstellung und Kritik des modernen Pietismus, Stuttg., 1839. Comp. *Dorner*, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1840, part i.

§ 278.

ZINZENDORF AND THE UNITED BRETHERN. WESLEY AND THE METHODISTS. SWEDENBORG.

In the course of the eighteenth century a new sect took its rise, which exerted a considerable influence upon the mind of the age,

and the development of Christian life in general. It was founded in Herrnhut by *Count Zinzendorf*,[1] and is known with its branches by the name of the *Society of the United Brethren*.[2] Though owing its origin for the most part to Pietism,[3] it differed from it on several points, its object being, not so much a general reform of the church and its doctrines, as the organization of a particular Christian community. Count Zinzendorf for himself adopted the Confessio Augustana as his creed, but without excluding the members of other Christian denominations.[4] Nevertheless, by attaching great importance to certain doctrines, and by his mode of treating them, he imparted a novel and somewhat sentimental aspect to the old Lutheran theology. The theology of Herrnhut is characterized by a spirit of ardent love to the person of the Saviour, and a hearty reliance upon his merits, but it is at the same time deeply tinged with a sensuous tendency.[5] The theologians of his school, conscious of a higher vocation, endured with calmness the scorn of the world, and the censures passed upon them by learned and pious divines.[6] *John Wesley*, the founder of *Methodism*, in his strict preaching of repentance was animated by a practical rather than a strict theological spirit, and exerted in his time a far greater influence upon England than upon Germany.[7] More sympathy was there felt (in addition to the pietist and mystic tendencies) with the theosophic doctrines of *Immanuel Swedenborg*, the founder of the *Church of the New Jerusalem*.[8] These consisted chiefly in a peculiar mixture of rationalistic and mystical ideas, and made progress in wide circles.

[1] *Zinzendorf*, was born 1700, and died 1760. See the accounts of his life given by *Spangenberg*, *Schrautenbach*, *Varnhagen von Ense* (Biographische Denkmale, vol. v.), and *Tholuck*, vermischte Schriften, i. p. 433. *G. Müller*, Selbstbekenntnisse merkwürdiger Männer, vol. iii. *Herder's* Adrastea (Werke zur Philosophie, x. p. 61). *Knapp* in the Preface to his ed. of Z.'s hymns [1845.] [*Schrautenbach*, Graf. von Zinz. herausg. von *F. W. Kölbing*, 1851. *O. Glaubrecht*, Z. in der Wetterau, 1852–3. *J. F. Schröder*, Z. und Herrnhut, Nordhausen, 1857. *L. Bovet*, Le Comte de Zinzendorf, 2 Tom. Par. 1857.]

[2] The first congregation was founded A. D. 1722. Concerning the history of the society of the United Brethren, see *Cranz*, alte und neue Brüderhistorie, Barby, 1772, continued by *Hegner*, 1794—1804. *Schaaf*, die evangelischen Brüdergemeinden Leipz., 1825. See the literature in Niedner's Kirchengesch. p. 763. [*John Holmes*, Hist. of Unit. Brethren, 2, Lond., 1825. *B. Latrobe*, Hist. Account of the Moravians, transl. from the German, 1775; transl. by *Crantz*, 1780. *E. W. Cröger*, Gesch. d. erneuerten Brüdergemeinde, iii. Bde., 1852–4. *A. Bost*, Histoire ancienne et moderne de l'église des Frères de Bohème et Moravie, 2, Paris, 1844. *Benham*, Mem. of *Jas. Hutton*, (founder of English branch), 8vo., Lond., 1857.– Against them, see *J. A. Bengel*, Abriss der Brüdergemeinde, 1751, reprinted, 1859.

—*James Henry*, Sketches of Moravian Life and Character, Phil., 1855. *E. de Schweinetz*, Moravian Manual, Phil., 1859.—Articles in Meth. Quarterly (N. Y.), 1859; Christ. Examiner (Bost.), 1859; Qu. Church Review, 1860.]

[3] Pietism at the beginning of the eighteenth century, had either degenerated into a dead formalism, or it was in part corrupted by all sorts of fanatical tendencies which attached themselves to it. It belongs to the History of the Church, rather than the History of Doctrines to give an estimate of these. See *F. W. Krug*, Kritische Geschichte der protest. Schwarmerei, Secterei, und der gesammten un- und widerkirchlichen Neuerungen im Grossherzogthum Berg, Elberfeld, 1851. *W. Barthold*, Die Erweckten im protest. Deutschland während des Ausgangs des 17n. und der ersten Hälfte des 18n. Jahrhunderte (in *Raumer's* Taschenbuch, 1852). *Gobel*, Geschichte des christl. Lebens, etc., 3 Bde., 1860.

[4] This (relative) indifference as regards denominational differences gave offence to many. Zinzendorf himself adopted the Confessio Augustana; his church was also recognised (1748) by the ecclesiastical authorities of Saxony as one whose creed was allied to that of the Augsburg Confession. But some Calvinistic congregations, in the διασπορᾷ (*e. g.* that of Basle) did not hesitate to join the Society of the United Brethren.

[5] Terms such as *Bluttheologie* (*i. e.* the theology of Christ's Blood), *Wunden-Litanei* (*i. e.* the litany of Christ's wounds), *Wunden-Homilien* (*i. e.* the homilies on Christ's wounds), etc., were introduced by Zinzendorf and his followers. In their sacred hymns reference was frequently made to Christ's blood, wounds, his pierced side, etc.; compare the work entitled: Die *altlutherische Bluttheologie* in einem Auszuge aus des sel. Dr. Ahasveri Fritzschens sogenannten Himmelslust und Weltunlust, with the motto: Pasce me vulneribus, mens dulcescet. Leipzig und Görlitz, 1750; from which it is evident, that similar phraseology had been employed by others previous to the time of Zinzendorf. (Ahasv. Fritzsche died A. D., 1701.)—More moderate expressions were used by Bishop *A. G. Spangenberg* (born 1704, died 1792); see his Idea Fidei Fratrum, oder kurzer Begriff der christlichen Lehre, Barby, 1779-83. [An Exposition of Christian Doctrine, etc., written by Spangenberg, with Preface by *Benj. La Trobe*, Lond., 1784.] With the exception of that part of his work in which he treats of their ecclesiastical constitution, there is nothing in it which had not been propounded by other evangelical theologians.

[6] Among these we may mention *Carpzov*, in Dresden, *Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten*, in Halle, *John Philip Fresenius*, in Frankfort on the Main (1747–49), *J. A. Bengel* (1751), *Steinmetz*, abbot in the monastery of Bergen, *J. G. Walch*, and others.

[7] *John Wesley* was born 1703, and died 1791. Comp. *Southey*, the life of John W., and the rise and progress of Methodism, ed. 2, Lond., 1820, ii.; translated into German, by *F. A. Krummacher*, Hamb., 1828. *H. Moore*, the life of J. W., Lond., 1824, ii. vol. *Watson*, the life of John Wesley; translated into German, with a preface by *Bonnet*. Frankf., 1839. *Bruckhardt*, vollständige Geschichte der Methodisten in England, Nürnb., 1795, 2 voll. *Baum*, Der Methodismus, Zür., 1838. *Jakoby* (a preacher of

Method. Episc. church), Handbuch des Methodismus, Bremen, 1853, 2te., Aufl., 1855. [Works of *Wesley*, Bristol, 1771, *sq.*, and New York (Book Concern). *T. Jackson*, Hist. of Method., Lond., 1838. *Isaac Taylor*, Wesley and Meth., Lond. (N. Y.), 1851. *J. Whitehead*, Lives of J. and C. Wesley, Lond., 2 vols., 1793. *J. Hampson*, Mem. of Wesley, and Hist. of Meth. 3 vols., Lond., 1791. *Southey's* Life of Wesley, ed. by Rev. *C. C. Southey*, Am. ed. by Rev. D. Curry, 2 vols., 1847; Life by *Richard Watson*; by *W. Nast* (Leben und Wirken der J. W.), Cincin., 1852. *Jackson's* Centenary of Methodism. *Larrabee*, Wesley and his Coadjutors. *Bangs'* Hist. of Meth., 4 vols. *Geo. Smith*, Hist. of Wesleyan Methodism, 1857. *Jas. Porter*, Companion of Methodism, 15th thousand, 1858. **Abel Stevens*, Hist. of Religious Movement of Eighteenth Century, called Methodism; vols. 1 and 2, New York, 1858–9.—Articles in British Quarterly, 1852, 1853; North British, 1852; Kitto's Journal, 3; Christ. Remembrancer, July, 1854; Meth. Quarterly Review in reply to Isaac Taylor's work (by *Perry*), 1855, and on Wesley, April, 1858, '59, '60.—The theological system of Wesleyanism is represented in the works of *John Fletcher* and *Richard Watson*. *John Fletcher* (Flechiere) born at Nym, Switzerland, 1729, vicar of Madely, died 1785. Works, 8 vols., 1803: (Bible Arminianism and Bible Calvinism; Checks to Antinomianism; Answer to Toplady, etc.) *Richard Watson*, Theological Institutes, 2d ed., 3 vols., Lond., 1824; frequently reprinted in the United States. Comp. also *Wilbur Fisk* (Prest. of Wesleyan Unio.) Calvinistic Controversy, new ed. New York, 1853. Meth. Qu. Rev., 1859, 1860.] His fellow laborer was *J. G. Whitefield* (died 1770). [Works of *Whitefield*, 6 vols., Lond., 1771; comp. Lit. and Theol. Review, 6; Christ Review, 3; New Englander, 3; North American for 1848; *Tracy's* Great Awakening, 1845; *Abel Stevens*, ubi supra.] Afterwards they separated on account of their different views concerning grace; Wesley adopted the Arminian, Whitefield retained the strict Calvinistic principles. Nor did they in all points agree with the Pietists and the United Brethren. These differences may be said to be, that the United Brethren, by a onesided presentation of the reconciliation already achieved, and of the experience of grace already attained, worked in a more quiet manner, but exposed to the danger of inactivity; while Methodism, by constantly urging repentance, had a wholesome moral influence, though it was exposed to the peril of awakening undue terrors in its subjects, and of condemning those that were without. Both tendencies have their common root in pietism, which also reconciles these extreme tendencies.

[1] *Immanuel* von *Swedenborg* was born 1688, and died 1777; from the year 1743, he considered himself divinely inspired. Comp. *Herder*, Adrastea (vol. ix. p. 502.) His principal works are: Arcana cœlestia, Lond., 1749, ss., 8, Tom. iv. ed. *Tafel*, Tüb., 1833. Vera Chr. Rel. complect. univ. Theol. Novæ Eccles. Amst., 1771, ii. 4. In Germany (and especially in Würtemberg) the cause of Swedenborg was espoused first by *Oetinger* (1765), and afterwards by *Tafel* (1838.) In modern times the doctrine of Swedenborg has been revived, and has gained adherents in France (*Oegger*) [the United States, England, etc.] For the literature compare Rheinwald, Repertorium, 1834, vol. ix. p. 217, ss. Respecting his doctrines, see *Hauber*, in the

Tübinger Zeitschrift, 1840, part 4: in reply, Swedenborg's Lehre, mit Rücksicht auf die Einwürfe gegen sie (in Swedenborg und seine Gegner, 3 Thl.) Stuttg., 1844. For the Literature, see *Niedner*, Kirchengeschichte, p. 766. [*Tafel*, Leben Swedenborgs, and Urkunden, 3 Thle., 1839–'42. Ibid., Vergleichende Darstellung der Lehrgegensätze d. Katholiken und Protest., mit den Unterscheidungslehren Swedenborgs, Tübing., 1845, in reply to *Möhler* (transl. by I. H. Smithson, Lond., 1841.) *Ed. Paxton Hood*, Swed., a Biography and Exposition, 1854. *Aug. Clissold*, Practical Nature of the Theol. writings of S., a Letter to the Abp. of Dublin, 1859 (he has also written many other works). *Robert Hindmarsh*, Rise and Progress of New Jerusalem Church, ed. by *E. Madely*, Lond., 1861. *Hobart*, Life of S., Boston, 1831. *J. J. G. Wilkinson*, Biog. of S., 1849: Popular Sketch of S.'s Phil. Works, 1847. Swedenborg's Arcana Apocalypse, Doctrine of N. T. Church, Divine Law and Wisdom, Christian Religion, etc., transl. and published in Boston. Minutes of General Conference, 1789, *sq.* *Geo. Bush*, New Church Repository, New York, 1847, *sq.*, and numerous works on Swedenborg.]

One aspect of Swedenborgianism (the spirit-seeing), was advocated by *Jung Stilling* (1740–1817), who, together with *J. Casper Lavater* (1741–1801) exerted himself for the preservation and promotion of the higher interests of religion among many of his contemporaries, even the educated classes of society. But this mystico-theosophic tendency is not to be confounded with the mysticism of Tauler and others; the former, floating in the prose of the 18th century, and having passed through all its reflective processes, is very different from the mediæval theosophic mysticism, nurtured by the poetry of the earlier periods. Comp. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Compendium, i. § 185.

§ 279.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF KANT. RATIONALISM AND SUPERNATURALISM.

Rosenkranz, Gesch. der Kantischen Philosophie, Lpz., 1840. *Erdmann*, Die Entwicklung der deutschen Speculation seit Kant., i., Lpz., 1848; comp. the next section. [*Kuno Fischer*, Gesch. d. neueren Phil., Bde., iii., iv., 1860, and Kant's Leben und Lehre, 1860. *J. Willm*, Histoire de la Philos. allemande, 4 vols., Paris, 1847. Article Kant, in New American Cyclopedia; by *Wirgman* in Encyclop. Londinensis; *Stupfer* in Princeton Rev., iv. *Cousin*, Lectures on Kant, 1832, in English by Henderson, 1854. *H. L. Mansel*, Lecture on the Philosophy of Kant, 1860. *Amand Saintes*, La Vie et la Philos. de Kant, Paris, 1844.]

After the indefinite philosophy of the eighteenth century had, for a long time, attempted to reduce religion to mere ethics, or at least to resolve all that is specifically Christian into general and abstract ideas of God, liberty, and immortality, with occasional reference to the current biblical doctrines, a new state of things was brought about by the rise of *Kantianism*, or the critical philosophy. This system gave a more definite expression to the previous desultory efforts, and, at the same time, circumscribed them in a wholesome way within the limits of a strictly scientific form. *Im-*

manuel Kant,[1] after the example of Hume, subjected the human intellect to a more searching examination, and found that this faculty, bound to time and space, is unable to fathom the depths of the Deity, can only apprehend the finite, and is therefore competent to supply an adequate rule only for our moral life. While Kant, on the one hand, thus denied to pure reason the power of making any certain statements concerning what is divine,[2] on the other he vindicated belief in the existence of God, liberty and immortality, by representing them as postulates of the practical reason.[3] That serious and wise man spoke of the Bible and Christianity in terms indicative of the highest reverence, and admitted that they were designed to be the medium by which the knowledge of these practical ideas was to be generally diffused among the people. Though the number of theologians was small who embraced the results of this new philosophy in a strictly scientific form,[4] such as *Tieftrunk*,[5] *Stäudlin*,[6] (at least for a time), and *Ammon*,[7] it may nevertheless be said, that what is now called *Rationalism*,[8] as opposed to *Supernaturalism*,[9] had its origin in the results of the critical philosophy of Kant. The representatives of that formal belief in revelation, termed *Supernaturalism*, which differs from the earlier forms of orthodoxy, were chiefly *Storr*,[10] and *Reinhard*;[11] the representatives of Rationalism, were *Wegscheider*,[12] *Paulus*,[13] and *Röhr*.[14] And lastly, there were some, such as *Schott*,[15] *Bretschneider*,[16] and *Tzschirner*,[17] who, by propounding what is called *rational Supernaturalism*, endeavored to reconcile these two extremes with each other, or, at least, to facilitate such a reconciliation.

[1] *Immanuel Kant* was born 1724, and died 1804 (in the year 1740 he studied theology). His complete works were edited by Rosenkranz and Schubert, Lpz., 1837 ss., xii. vols. [*Hartenstein*, x. vols., 1838–9.]

[2] In his work: Kritik der reinen Vernunft, Riga, 1781; 2nd ed., 1787. All later editions were merely reprinted from the second. [The variations in Schubert's and Hartenstein's edition. The Pure Reason was translated into English, Lond., 1841; Analysis of it, 1844; a new version by Meiklejohn, 1855; French, by Tissot, 2d ed., 1845.]

[3] See his works: Kritik der praktischen Vernunft, Riga, 1788: Kritik der Urtheilskraft, 1790. Of special importance for *theology* is his work Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, Königsb., 1793. 2nd improved edit., 1794. [Kant's Criticism of the Practical Reason was translated into French, by *Barni*, 1848; his Religion within the Bounds, etc., by Trullard, 1841; Criticism of Judgment, by Barni, 1846; other works by *Tissot*, etc. The first English work on Kant was a general and Introductory view, by *Nitzsch*, Lond., 1796: *J. S. Beck*, Principles of Critical Philos., 1798: *Willich's* Elements of Critical Philos., 1798: Kant's Essays and Treatises, 2 vols. 1798: *Wirgman's* Principles of the Kantesian Philosophy, 1824: *Semple*, Kant's Metaphysics of Ethics, 1837: *John Richardson*, Metaphysical works of Kant, 1836. *Noack*, Kant's Auferstehung aus

dem Grabe, 186. Comp. *E. A. Thilo* on Kant in Zeitschrift f. exacte Philosophie, 1860, s. 7–25, 298–321.]

[3] Comp. *Flügge*, Versuch einer historisch-kritischen Darstellung des bisherigen Einflusses der Kantischen Philosophie auf alle Zweige der wissenschaftl. und praktischen Theologie, Hanover, 1796, 1800, ii. 8. *Reinhard*, the preface to the third edition of his System der christlichen Moral, 1797. *J. F. Flatt*, Obss. ad comparandam doctr. Kant cum christiana, 1792. (Opusc. Nr. 7.) *Kessler*, Darstellung und Prüfung des Kantischen Rationalismus in der Religion, besonders in der Exegese, Würzb., 1818. *Ulrici* on Kant (and *Jacobi*, *Fries* and *Fichte*) in Herzog's Realencyclop. [Also his article on Religions-Philosophie.]

[4] *John Henry Teiftrunk* lived towards the close of the eighteenth century, and was private lecturer on philosophy in the university of Halle. He wrote: Versuch einer Kritik der Religion, 1790.—Censur des christlich-protestantischen Lehrbegriffs, mit besonderer Hinsicht auft die Lehrbücher von Döderlein und Morus, Berlin, 1791–95, 2nd edit., 1796. Dilucidationes ad Theoret. Christ. Rel., part 1793, ii.—Religion der Mündigen, 1800.

[5] *K. F. Stäudlin* was born 1761, and died 1826, as professor of theology in the university of Göttingen. He wrote Ideen zur Kritik der christlichen Religion, Gött., 1791. Lehrb. der Dogmatik und Dogmengeschichte, ibid., 1800. 3d edit., 1809: 4th edit., 1822.

[6] *C. F. Ammon*, born 1766, died 1850, was formerly professor of theology in the university of Erlangen, and first chaplain to the King of Saxony. He wrote: Entwurf einer wissenschaftlich praktischen Theologie, nach Grundsätzen der Vernunft und des Christenthums, 1797.—Abhandlungen zur Erläuterung einer wissenschaftlich-praktischen Theologie, 1798. Summa Theol. Christ., 1803, translated into German, 1805, ed. 4, 1830. Aufsührlicher Unterricht in der christlichen Glaubenslehre, für Freunde der evangelischen Wahrheit, 1807, 8.

[8] The term *Rationalism* was employed previous to the rise of the Kantian philosophy, and frequently used in the same sense as Naturalism and Deism. Comp. the sect of the Rationalists in England, § 238, note 2, and *Sucro*, Disputatio de Estimatione Rationis humanæ theologica, præside Paulo Antinio, 1706, p. 8: Hinc tantus undique numerus *Rationalistarum*, Naturalistarum, Libertinorum, Scepticorum, quinimo Atheorum; and p. 32: His *Rationalistio* totus mundus refertus est (quoted by *Tholuck*, ii. 25, 26). Nevertheless many still confound these terms, some intentionally, others unintentionally. They were separated by Kant himself (Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, pp. 216, 217). It may also be said that we have a historical right to make a distinction between that Rationalism, which has been systematically developed in Germany, and for more than half a century has exerted, and still exerts, upon the church an influence more or less considerable, though not always for good, and between that daring and frivolous Naturalism, which has its advocates not so much in the church as in the world. German Rationalism has, at least, retained an historical and Scriptural Christianity, and by making use of ecclesiastical institutions, *e. g.* by preaching, endeavored to promote the spread of moral and religious principles, especially in opposition to pantheistic tendencies, which threaten

to destroy the sense of true morality. Thus we may be permitted, in due acknowledgment of its merits, to speak of a *Christian* Rationalism. Some writers have employed the phrase *rationalismus vulgaris*, to distinguish it from its modern forms of development, which have not been recognized by its adherents. Comp. *Bretschneider*, Historische Bemerkungen über den Gebrauch der Ausdrücke Rationalismus und Supernaturalismus (Oppositionsschriften, vii. 1, 1829). *A. Hahn*, De Rationalismi qui dicitur vera Indole, Lips., 1827. *K. Hase*, Die Leipzigerdisputation, Lips., 182.—By the same: Streitschriften, i., p. 28; Dogmatik, p. 16, 36.—Some very appropriate remarks may also be found in Baumgarten-Crusius Compendium, i., p. 476. [*L. J. Rückert*, Der Rationalismus, Leipz., 1859.]

[9] In *one* aspect the supernaturalistic theologians themselves might adopt the principles of Kant, inasmuch as he had demonstrated the insufficiency of reason to fathom what is Divine. This was done by *Storr* in his Bemerkungen über Kant's philosophische Religionslehre, translated from the Latin by *Süsskind*, Tub., 1794; see *Baumgarten-Crusius*, i., p. 466. But Kant did not draw the inference that a revelation is necessary *on account of* the insufficiency of reason; on the contrary, he set it aside by denying to reason the power of setting up any other than a moral criterion by which to ascertain whether anything has been revealed. Revelation was to him problematical, and positive religion was merely the medium by which the practical truths of reason are communicated. Compare the special history of doctrines.

[10] *Gottl. Chr. Storr* was born 1746, and died 1805, as professor in the university of Tübingen. Among his works were: Doctrinæ Christianæ Pars Theoretica, 1793. Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik, ins Deutsche übersetzt mit Erläuterungen von *C. Ch. Flatt*, 1803. On the conservative tendency of the school of Tübingen, see *Tholuck*, ii., p. 145–47. [Storr and Flatt, Bibl. Theology, by *S. S. Schmucker*, Andov., 2d ed., 1836.]

[11] *Francis Volkmar Reinhard*, was born 1753, and died 1812, as first chaplain to the King of Saxony. See his:—Geständnisse, Sulzb., 1810. Epitome Theol. Christ. e S. V. Reinhardi acroasibus academ. descript. atque observat. auct. (ed. *Hœpfner*) 1805. Vorlesungen über Dogmatik, mit litterarischen Zusätzen herausgegeben von *F. B. Berger*, 1801, and *H. A. Schott*, Sulzb., 1811. The supernaturalism of Reinhard is ethical and intellectual, and had its origin partly in a fine conscientiousness, partly in strictly logical inferences which he drew from certain philosophical premises. Its fundamental principle was not very different from that of Rationalism; and the sermons of Reinhard, which are distinguished by a prevailing moralising treatment of Scripture, have served as models for many rationalistic discourses. Pure biblical Supernaturalism unmixed with ecclesiastical tradition, or philosophical principles, is represented in the following works: *A. Hahn*, Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens, Leipz., 1828 [new edition, improved, 2 vols., Leipz., 1857–8]; *G. Ch. Knapp*, Vorlesungen über die christliche Glaubenslehre, nach dem Lehrbegriff der evangelischen Kirche, herausgegeben von *G. Thilo*, Halle, 1827 [translated by Leonard Woods, Andover, 2 vols. 1831, and frequently republished], (see vol. i., p. 30.); and Biblische Glau

benslehre, vornehmlich für den praktischen Gebrauch, herausgegeben von *Guericke*, Halle, 1840.

[12] *J. A. L. Wegscheider*, born 1771, d. 1848, from the year 1810 professor of theology in the university of Halle. He wrote: Institutiones Theologiæ Christianæ dogmaticæ, 1813, edit. 8, 1844. He was opposed by *W Steiger*, Kritik des Rationalismus in Wegscheiders Dogmatik, Berlin, 1844.

[13] *H. E. G. Paulus*, born 1761, d. 1851, in Heidelberg (formerly in Jena), as a professor and ecclesiastical counsellor. He endeavored to promote Rationalism by exegetical works (*e. g.* Commentar über das Neue Testament.—Leben Jesu), and by advocating liberal principles in some of his writings *e. g.* Sophronizon, 1818, ss. Der Denkgläubige, 1825, '29.

[14] *J. F. Röhr*, born 1777, died 1848 as General Superintendent in Weimar. He wrote: Briefe über den Rationalismus, zur Berichtigung der schwankenden und zweideutigen Urtheile, die in den neuesten dogmatischen Consequenzstreitigkeiten über denselben gefällt worden sind, Sondershausen, 1813.—From the year 1820 he edited the "Kritische Predigerbibliothek" (Critical Journal for Ministers). He further published: Grund- und Glaubenssätze der evangelisch-protestantischen Kirche, Neust., 1732, '34, and Sermons.

[15] *H. A. Schott*, born 1780, died 1835, as professor of theology in the university of Jena. He wrote: Epitome Theol. Dogmaticæ, Lipz., 1811, '22.

[16] *K. G. Bretschneider*, born 1776, died 1848, as General Superintendent in Gotha. He wrote: Handbuch der Dogmatik der lutherisch-evangelischen Kirche, Leipz., 1814, 18, ii., edit. 4th, 1838. Systematische Entwicklung aller in der Dogmatik vorkommenden Begriffe, nach den symb. Büchern der prot. luth. Kirche, ibid., 1805, latest edit., 1841. (His tendency is chiefly historical.)

[17] *H. G. Tzschirner*, born 1778, died 1828 as professor of theology and superintendent in Leipsic. He wrote: Vorlesungen über die christl. Glaubenslehre, nach dem Lehrbegriffe der evang. protest. Kirche, edited by *K. Hase*, Leipz., 1829. (In this work the two systems of Rationalism and Supernaturalism are coordinately developed.)

A striking parallel may be drawn between the rationalistic system of Kant (as well as the earlier system of Wolf) on the one hand, and the development of literature on the other. The period of Schiller (his poem: Worte des Glaubens), compared with the poem of Urania by *Tiedge* (1801). The same tendency manifested itself in works of a popular character (in homiletical writings, in religious books, and in works designed for the young), *e. g.* in the works entitled: Stunden der Andacht (*i. e.* Hours of Devotion), and its effect in Dinters Schullehrerbibel (*i. e.* the Schoolmaster's Bible, edit. by Dinter.)

§ 280.

MODERN SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY. FICHTE. SCHELLING.

C. M. Michelet, Geschichte der Philosophie von Kant bis Hegel. Berlin, 1837, 2 vols. *Chalybæus, H. M.*, historische Entwicklung der speculativen Philosophie von Kant bis Hegel. Dresd., 1837, 3d edit. 1843, [5th ed. 1860. Translated and published in

Edinb. and Andover, 1857]. *C. Fortlage*, Genetische Geschichte der Philosophie seit Kant. Leipz., 1852. [*J. D. Morell*, Historical and Critical View of the Speculative Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century, 2 vols., repr., New York, 1856. *Amand Saintes*, Histoire critique du Rationalisme en Allemagne, 2me. éd., Paris, 1843. †*Oischinger*, Speculative Entwicklung d. Philos. von Descartes bis Hegel, 2 Bde., 1854. *Bartholmess*, Les Doctrines religieuses de la Philosophie Allemande, 2 Tom., 1856. *Hermann Ulrici*, Geschichte und Kritik der Principien der neueren Philosophie. 2 Thle., Leipz., 1845.]

During the period in which the philosophy of Kant prevailed, both Rationalism and Supernaturalism occupied common ground in this, that the mode of thinking adopted by their adherents was abstract, and circumscribed by the categories of the understanding. It was not until the rise of the modern system of speculative philosophy, in the *Idealism of Fichte*,[1] and afterwards in the more developed form of *Schelling's* Philosophy of the *Absolute*,[2] that attention was again directed to that which was most profound and significant in the doctrines of Christianity, *i. e.* in the first place, to their speculative import ; thus leading thinking minds from the mere periphery of religious life back to its centre. The Rationalists and Supernaturalists, attaching too much importance to the empirical and practical aspect of religion, had lost sight of its more profound and speculative aspect. The opposite tendency now showed itself. The founders of this new esoteric Gnosis introduced an enigmatic phraseology, which appeared to their contemporaries as a sort of hieroglyphic language. To formulas, orthodox in sound, they attached a sense different from that contained in the doctrines of the church, and sometimes even incompatible with practical religious truth. Not only was history converted into a mere mythical garb for speculative ideas, but *Kant's* Trias of *God, Liberty, and Immortality*, in which the Rationalists had hitherto believed with a certain honest sobriety, must needs vanish in the presence of that *Pantheism*, which annuls the personality of God and of man, and confounds the Divine Being with the world. So that while some were rejoicing at the return of what they considered a Christian philosophy, others questioned the advantage of this exchange of Rationalism for the speculative philosophy.[3]

[1] *J. C. Fichte*, born 1762, died 1814, as professor of philosophy in the university of Berlin. In the development of his system, different periods may be pointed out. In his Versuch einer Kritik aller Offenbarung, 1792, which was published anonymously, and for a time ascribed to Kant, he took the same ground which had long been occupied by the latter. But his Wissenschaftslehre, 1794, ss., is altogether speculative-idealistic ; it is a question, whether the principles set forth in it are only apparently or really atheistic. On account of its purely speculative shape, it was unfitted to be directly applied to theology. In his later writings (composed in a more popular style)

Fichte endeavored to express himself in a more Christian manner, and to show the agreement existing between his own principles and those of Christianity. This is the case especially in his Anweisung zum seligen Leben, oder die Religionslehre, Berlin, 1806. In this work he attaches, in opposition to a moralising Rationalism, the greatest importance to the Gospel of John, and founds his system on the unity of the Father with the Son (whom he regards as God attaining unto a consciousness of himself in man).—Compare *John Bapt. Schad* (a Benedictine monk), Gemeinfassliche Darstellung des Fichte'schen Systems und der daraus hervorgehenden Religionstheorie, Erf., 1800–1802, iii. voll.; and *Baumgarten-Crusius*, i. p. 455–457. *K. Hase*, Jenaisches Fichtebüchlein, Lpz., 1856. [*Fichte's* Characteristics of the Present Age, Nature of the Scholar, Vocation of Men, and Vocation of the Scholar, with other works, transl. into English by *Smith*, with a Memoir, London. His son, I. H., published his father's memoir and remains. Works, 8 vols.: Remains, 3 vols.]

[2] *F. W. Jos. von Schelling*, born 1775, in 1841 called from Munich to be professor of philosophy in the university of Berlin, d. 1854. He endeavored to bring about a reconciliation between the Idealism of Fichte and the theory of Realism (subject and object) by the philosophy of identity (like Spinoza). Comp. his Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums, Stuttg. und Tub., 1803, 13, especially Lecture 8th (Concerning the historical construction of Christianity), and Lecture 9th (On the study of theology). He there states, in opposition to the Rationalism of Kant (p. 180), that the doctrines "*of the incarnate God*," and (p. 184) of "*the reconciliation of the finite (beings) which had fallen from God*," are the first elements of Christianity, completed and perfected in the doctrine of the *Trinity;* this doctrine, however, "is *absurd*, unless it be considered in its *speculative aspect*" (p. 192). In Lecture 9th he combats empirical Supernaturalism, the Rationalism of Kant, and lastly the *historical* reception of Christianity.—He further wrote Philosophie und Religion, Tüb., 1804. Denkmal der Schrift von den göttlichen Dingen des Herrn F. J. Jacobi (comp. § 281), Tüb., 1812.—In the later period of his life, Schelling manifested a stronger leaning towards positive Christianity and theistic views; see his preface to Victor Cousin, translated from the French by *Beckers*, Stutt., 1834. Comp. *A. Planck*, Schelling's Nachgelassene Werke und ihre Bedeutung für die Theologie (in the Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christliche Wissenschaft, viii., März., 1857).—The disciples of Schelling at first cultivated the science of natural philosophy, rather than the philosophy of religion and of theology. His philosophy was applied to theology by *Heinrich Blasche* (died 1832): Das Böse, im Einklange mit der Weltordnung dargestellt, Leipz., 1827, and Philosophie der Offenbarung, Gotha, 1829. As regards the relation in which *Eschenmayer* stands to the philosophy of Schelling, see *Reinhold*, Geschichte der Philosophie, ii. 2, p. 388. It must also be admitted that the philosophical tendencies of *Schleiermacher* were connected with those of Schelling, though he applied them to religion and theology in a very different manner, more like to *Jacobi* (see § 281). [Schelling's Sämmtliche Werke; the second division, 4 vols., contains his Lectures, viz., vol. i., Introduction to Mythology; ii., Philosophy of Mythology; iii. iv., Philosophy

of Revelation. Comp. Schelling und Theologie, Berl., 1846.' *Dorner*, Schelling's Potenzlehre, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1860, s. 101–156; *Ehrenfeuchter* on Schelling's Philosophie d. Mythologie und Offenbarung, ibid., 1859. *E. A. Weber*, Examen critique de la Philos. religieuse de Schelling, Strasb., 1860. Southern Quarterly Review, Feb., 1857.]

[3] Comp. his controversy with *Jacobi*. *F. Köppen*, Schellings Lehre, oder das Ganze der Lehre vom absoluten Nichts, Hamb., 1803.—*G. F. Süsskind*, Prüfung der Schellingschen Lehre von Gott, Weltschöpfung, moralischer Freiheit, etc., Tub., 1812. [*H. E. G. Paulus*, Die endlich offenbar gewordene positive Philosophie der Offenbarung, Darmstadt, 1843. [*Kapp*,] Friedrich Wilhelm Jos. von Schelling, von einem vieljährigen Beobachter, Lpz., 1843. *Alexis Schmidt*, Beleuchtung der neuen Schellingschen Lehre, Berl., 1843. *Rosenkrans*, on Schelling, 1844. *Noack*, Schelling und die Philos. der Romantik, 2 Thle., 1860.]

Here again is a parallel in literature and art, viz., the Romantic tendency (the brothers *Schlegel*, *Tieck*, *Novalis*), *Göthe* (viewed in contrast with Schiller); *Creuzer* and *Voss*, Symbolik und Antisymbolik.

§ 281.

HERDER AND JACOBI. DE WETTE AND SCHLEIERMACHER.

Though the speculative philosophy of Fichte and Schelling seemed to have brought about a certain reconciliation between the two extremes above mentioned, it was still to be seen whether that reconciliation was a real one. *Herder*, in the spirit of a poet,[1] pointed out the historical nature of the Christian doctrines, as well as the distinction between religion and doctrinal opinions, and opened the way, in connection with modern culture, to a new and living treatment of Scriptural subjects, founded on more accurate views of oriental and biblical modes of thought. On the other hand, the philosophy of the Absolute was combated by *Frederic Jacobi*,[2] with pious wisdom. In opposition to this philosophy, he endeavoured to show that faith, which he distinguished from knowledge, must have its quiet home in the human heart. Though he did not mean by faith either the orthodox faith of the church, or strict Scriptural faith (in the supernaturalistic sense), his more profound and prophetic theory was welcomed, even by those who felt the necessity of a more positive system. The philosophical system of Jacobi, designed to meet the religious feelings of men, served as the basis of a new school, the adherents of which are also disposed to adopt the principles of modern philosophy in general.[3] They endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation between the extremes, by historico-critical, as well as philosophical researches, by psychologico-anthropological rather than by speculative investigations. As its founders, we may regard *De Wette*,[4] *and Schleiermacher*,[5] though each in a different aspect.

The former labored to show, in a psychological and synthetic way, the symbolical religious value of the doctrines of Christianity, in their relation to the souls of believers; the latter endeavoured, in an analytical and dialectic manner, to apprehend, in Christianity, that which is peculiar to itself, and to represent the doctrines of the church as the perpetual expression of the feelings common to all believers.

[1] *Johann Gottfried von Herder*, born 1744, died 1803, as General Superintendent in Weimar. Among his numerous works are: Werke zur Religion und Theologie, Stuttg. and Tub., 1827–30, 18 vols. Though Herder did not publish a system of theology, he exerted by his enlightened views (misunderstood by many) the highest influence upon theology. Among his theological works, the following have a special reference to the subject in question: Briefe über das Studium der Theologie, Brief 29 ss.; Christliche Schriften (vom Erlöser der Menschen; von Gottes Sohn, der Welt Heiland; vom Geist des Christenthums; von Religion, Lehrmeinungen und Gebräuchen).—The theological views of Herder are given in a collective form in J. G. von Herder's Dogmatik, aus dessen Schriften dargestellt und mit litterischen und kritischen Anmerkungen versehn von einem Freunde der Herder'schen Gnosis (Augusti?), Jena, 1805, 8. Comp. the Herder-Album, Jena, 1845: Herder's Lebensbild, von seinem Sohne, Erlangen, 1846, ii.; and *Hagenbach* in Herzog's Realencyclopädie. [On Herder, see *George Bancroft*, in North Am. Rev., vol. xx.; For. Rev. xxxvii.; Christian Disciple (H's Letters on Study of Divinity, vols. ii. iii.) His Spirit of Heb. Poetry, transl. by Jas. Marsh, 2 vols., Burlington, Vt., 1833. Comm. on Revel., transl. by *Sir George Duckett*, Lond., 1821. Outlines and Philosophy of History, transl. by *T. Churchill*, Lond., 1800, 4to., 2d. ed., 2 vols. 1803. Oriental Dialogues, Lond., 1801.]

[2] *Friedrich Jacobi*, born 1743, was, from the year 1804, President of the Academy of Sciences in Munich, died 1819. His entire works were published, Leipz., 1812, 6 voll., his correspondence, Leipz., 1825–27, 2 voll. Compare his Von den göttlichen Dingen und ihrer Offenbarung, Leipz., 1811, and *J. Kuhn*, Jacobi und die Philosophie seiner Zeit, Mainz, 1824. *Fricker*, Philos. Jacobi, Augsb., 1854.

[3] Schleiermacher acknowledged that he derived his first impulse from Jacobi (*Baumgarten-Crusius*, i. p. 468); Schelling also exerted some influence upon him. On the other hand, De Wette adhered to the principles of *Fries*, who endeavored to complete the philosophy of Kant on the principles of Jacobi; the three terms he uses are, knowledge, faith, longing (*Ahnung*).

[4] *W. M. Leberecht de Wette*, born 1780, professor of theology in the university of Berlin from the year 1810 to 1819, from 1821 professor of theology in the university of Basle, d. 1849. His theological opinions are developed in his: Erläuterungen zum Lehrbuch der Dogmatik, über Religion und Theologie, Berlin, 1821.—Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik in ihrer historischen Entwicklung, Berl., 1821, 2 voll., Edit. 3d, 1820.—Christliche Sittenlehre, ibid., 1819–24, 3 voll., 8vo. The following are written in a popular style: Ueber die religion, ihr Wesen, ihre Erscheinungsformen

und ihren Einfluss auf das Leben (a course of public lectures), Berl., 1827, 8. —Theodor oder des Zweiflers Weihe, 1821–28, 2 voll.—Sermons. *Das Wesen des christl. Glaubens, vom Standpunkte des Glaubens dargestallt, Berlin, 1846. Comp. *Schenkel*, De Wette und die Bedeutung seiner Theologie für unsere Zeit; *Hagenbach*, W. M. L. de Wette, eine akademische Gedächtnissrede, 1850; *Lücke*, W. M. L. De Wette, Hamb., 1850. [De Wette's Introd. to O. Test., transl. and enlarged by *Theodore Parker*, 2 vols. 1850; Human Life, or Practical Ethics, by *S. Osgood*, 2 vols.; Theodore, or Sceptic's Conversion, by *J. F. Clarke*, 2 vols., Boston.]

[5] *Friedrich Schleiermacher*, born 1768, died 1834, as professor of theology in the university of Berlin. Among his works are: Ueber Religion. Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern, Berlin, 1799. (This work in its first form has but slight reference to positive Christianity: it rather favors the suspicion of pantheism; but he already views religion as essentially a feeling, in contrast with its being either knowledge or action; the later editions (4th, 1829) in the notes indicate the transition from these Orations to the standpoint of his Christian Dogmatics.—Darstellung des theologischen Studiums, Berlin, 1811, 30.—Der christliche Glaube, nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhange dargestellt, Berl., 1821, 2 vols., 1830, 2 voll.—Sermons. (An edition of his entire works was commenced 1834, in three divisions.) Comp. *H. Braniss*, über Schleiermachers Glaubenslehre, Leipz., 1835. *K. Rosenkranz*, Kritik der Schleiermacher'schen Glaubenslehre, Königsb., 1836. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Schleiermachers Denkart und Verdienst, Jena, 1834. *Lücke* (Studien und Kritiken, 1834, part 4.) *G. Weissenborn*, Darstellung und Kritik der Schleiermacher Dogmatik, Lpz., 1549 [der Schleiermacher Dialectik, 1847.] *Lücke*, in Studien und Kritiken, 1834. *Strauss*, Schleiermacher und Daub, in the Halle'sche Jahrbücher, 1834, No. 20* [reprinted in *Strauss's* Characteristiken und Kritiken, 1839. Comp. also, *Heinrich Schmid*, Schleiermacher's Glaubenslehre, 1835; *J. G. Rätze*, Erläuterungen zu S.'s christl. Glauben., Lpz., 1823; *F. W. Gess*, Uebersicht über das theol. System Dr. Fr. S. 2te Aufl. Rentling, 1837; *F. Vorländer*, Schleiermacher Sittenlehre (a crowned prize treatise), Marb., 1851; *Hartenstein*, De Ethices a S. propos. Fundamento, part. 2, Lips., 1837. *Jul. Schaller*, Vorlesungen über Schleiermacher, 1844. *Herzog*, Ueber die Anwendung des ethischen Princips der Individualität in S.'s Theologie, Stud. und Krit., 1846. *Stechow*, S. und die neuere Theologie in Deutsche Zeitschrift, July, 1855. *Sigwart*, S.'s Erkenntnisstheorie, in Jahrb. für deutsche Theol., 1857; ibid., S.'s psychologische Voraussetzungen, in the same.]

[Translations of Schleiermacher's Essay on Luke, by *C. Thirlwall* (while still a student of law), Lond., 1825; Introd. to Plato's Dialogues, by *Dodson*, 1827; on Sabellius and Trinity, by *Moses Stuart* in Bibl. Repos. v. vi.; Outlines of Study of Theology, by *Farrar*, Edinb., 1850. On Schleierma-

* For the genesis of Schleiermacher's System, see his Correspondence with *J. Ch. Gass*, with a biographical preface by *W. Gass*, Berl., 1852; his Autobiography (in his 26th year), published by *Lommatzsch*, in the Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol., 1851; and *Gelzer's* Monatsblätter, vi. on Schleiermacher and the United Brethren, a contribution to the internal history of German Protestantism.

cher and De Wette, being a Third Letter to Mr. Andrews Norton (in the Controversy on the "Latest Form of Infidelity,") by *George Ripley*, Bost., 1840. *Bretschneider's* View of Schleiermacher's Theology, translated in Bibliotheca Sacra., Andover, 1853, pp. 596–617. *H. Davis*, Schleiermacher, in Christ. Exam. (Boston), July, 1852. Schleiermacher in Kirchenfreund, 1854, a series of articles. Schleiermacher's Life and Times, National Rev. (Lond.), April, 1859. *G. Baur* on S. (in Studien und Kritiken) translated in Presb. Qu. Rev. (Phil.), Jan., 1860. Schleiermacher's Leben in Briefen, 2, Berl., 1858, transl. by *Rowan*, 2 vols., Lond., 1859; comp. Westminster Rev., July, 1861.—The theology of Schleiermacher made an epoch, in consequence of its peculiar relation to the two opposite systems of rationalism and supernaturalism, in the midst of whose conflicts it appeared. It "combines the elements of both, in representing the essence of Christianity to be the immediate utterance of the religious consciousness, which in its inmost spirit, it says, is Christian." This Christian consciousness "has, on the one hand, whatever is essential in Christianity; while, on the other hand, it is viewed as only the more definite explication and concrete expression of what is inherent in man's religious nature." The same general tendency of thought represented by Kant is also developed in Schleiermacher's system; but this is only one of its aspects. The other aspect is "that what makes the substance of the Christian consciousness is not something which it produces, by and of itself, but something imparted and received. The Christian consciousness is the reflex and expression of the Christian fellowship." See *Baur*, Dogmengeschichte, p. 353.]

§ 282.

ATTEMPTS AT RESTORATION. PRACTICAL PIETY AND MODERN THEOLOGY.

But this reconciliation, which could be appreciated only by the educated classes of society, did not meet the wants of Christians at large. Though the conflict between Rationalism and Supernaturalism at first appeared to be confined to the schools, a general desire after more substantial spiritual food soon manifested itself among the people, for a long time indifferent to their religious interests, but now aroused by the signs of the times. Instead of the timid Supernaturalism of the schools, itself not unaffected by Rationalism, the ancient faith boldly raised its voice against modern culture. *Claus Harms*, on the occasion of the centenary of the German Reformation, published a number of theses, in which he proclaimed the necessity of returning to the old Lutheran faith, and proved that the religion of reason is worthless.[1] *Sartorius* pointed out the close relation existing between Rationalism and Romanism.[2] The controversy raged with violence, both parties denouncing each

other.[3] But the prevailing practical tendency of the age, which manifested itself in the spread of the Scriptures and of religion, and in the founding of religious societies,[4] prevented some of the evils which have been expected from these contests. Nor was the progress of scientific theology neglected; on the contrary, it is grateful to see that the nobler interests of science were elevated above these struggles. Commentators, as well as the writers on ecclesiastical history, obtained a clearer perception of the necessity of guarding against dogmatical prejudices on the one hand, and, on the other, of entering into more profound researches as to the real nature of their topics, and of handling these subjects as living forms, in contrast with the setting up of dead schemes.[5] The distinguishing principles of the various denominations, the consideration of which had long been neglected from want of interest, were now more fully and scientifically discussed in the works on Symbolism.[6] Christian Ethics was brought into closer connection with systematic theology,[7] the whole of theological science was regarded in a new light,[8] and the way was prepared for a total reformation in practical theology.[9]

[1] *Claus Harms*, born 1778, was professor of theology in the university of Kiel, died 1855 (Comp. Rheinwald, Repertorium, xxx. p. 54; his Autobiography, Kiel, 1851; *Baumgarten*, Denkmal für Claus Harms, Braunschweig, 1855; *Pelt*, in Herzog's Realencyclop.). The title of the work refered to is: Das sind die 95 Theses oder Streitsätze Dr. Luthers, zum besondern Abdrucke besorgt, und mit andern 95 Sätzen vermehrt, Keil, 1817. On the controversy to which it gave rise, see the Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, 1829, No. 45–48, 58–60, 80, ss., 88, ss. (Both Ammon and Schleiermacher took part in it.) Afterwards he wrote: "Dass es mit der Vernunftreligion nichts ist," Leipz., 1819, to which *Krug* replied in his treatise: "Dass es mit der Vernunftreligion doch etwas ist." [Among these keen Theses of Harms are the following: 2. A progressive Reformation, as now understood, reforms Lutheranism into heathenism, and Christianity out of the world. 5. The Pope of our times, our Antichrist, in respect to faith is Reason; in respect to action is Conscience. 11. Conscience cannot forgive sins. 21. In the sixteenth century, forgiveness of sins cost money; in the nineteenth we have it for nothing; we do it ourselves. 24. The old hymn book says: "Thou hast two places before thee, O man!" Now-a-days, the devil is killed, and hell walled up. 32. The so-called rational religion is either without religion, or without reason, or without both. 33. It says, the moon is the sun. 42. The relation of the so-called natural religion to revealed, is like the relation of nothing to something, or else like the relation of revealed religion to revealed religion.—*Baumgarten-Crusius* wrote against Harms, XCV. Theses Theologiæ contra Superstitionem et Profanationem. *Schrödter*, Archiv. d. Harms'schen Thesen, oder Charakteristik der Schriften, die für oder gegen dieselben erschienen sind, Altona, 1818.]

[2] *E. W. Ch. Sartorius*, born 1797, professor of theology in the univer-

sity of Königsberg, then in Dorpat, d. 1859. He wrote: die Religion ausserhalb der Grensen der blossen Vernunft, nach den Grundsätzen des wahren Protestantismus gegen die eines falschen Rationalismus, Marb., 1822. [Defence of Augsburg Confession, 2d ed., 1853; Christ's Person and Work, transl. by *O. S. Stearns*, Bost., 1850; Doctrine of Holy Love, 3 vols, 1840–56; on Worship, 1852; Soli Deo Gloria, 1859.] Comp. also *Heinr. Steffens*, von der falschen Theologie und dem wahren Glauben, eine Stimme aus der Gemeinde, Breslau, 1823.

[3] The Rationalists charged the Supernaturalists (Pietists, mystics), with holding Antiprotestant principles; the Supernaturalists demanded in their turn, that their opponents should secede from the church, and sometimes insisted upon their expulsion.—The Disputation of Leipsic, 1827.—The Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, edited by Hengstenberg, took a prominent part in this controversy.—Respecting the denunciations of Halle, and other events, see *Hase*, Church Hist., p. 562. [*Hase*, Die Leipz. Disputation, 1827. *Rudelbuch*, Das Wesen des Rationalism., 1830. Gesenius and Wegscheider were the special objects of attack in Hengstenberg's Journal. Comp. Urkunden betreffend die neuesten Ereignisse, etc., Lpz., 1830; Fortgesetzte Urkunden, 1830. *Bretschneider*, Schreiben an einen Staatsmann, 1830; Zweites Schreiben, 1830. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Gewissensfreiheit, etc., Berl., 1830.]

[4] These were the Bible Societies and Missionary Societies which, after the example given by England, were established on the continent, *e. g.*, in Basle, 1816, Berlin, 1823.—They are the most eloquent apologists!—The advocates of mere negative principles only criticise, but do not produce anything.

[5] After exegesis, subsequently to the time of *Ernesti* (though often in an arbitrary method) had again become the servant of theological opinions (thus in the case of Storr and Paulus), *Winer* advocated the claims of the grammatico-historical interpretation, while *Lücke* (in his commentaries on the writings of John), prepared the way for a dynamic and penetrating system of interpretation. Ecclesiastical history, which formerly had often been regarded as the history of human follies, was treated with laudable impartiality by *Gieseler*, and proved by *Neander* [David Mendel], to indicate the development of the kingdom of God on earth. It is worthy of observation, that the newly awakened historical tendency also manifested itself in many monographs on historical subjects. These and other circumstances contributed to a more scientific treatment of systematic theology, and helped to frighten away the ghosts on both sides.

[6] *Marheineke* and *Winer*, etc., see Vol. i. p. 42.

[7] *De Wette* pointed out many defects in the treatment of Christian ethics in his Kritische Uebersicht der Ausbildung der theologischen Sittenlehre seit Calixt (Theologische Zeitschrift, Berlin, 1819, p. 247, ss.)—Christian ethics were treated in connection with systematic theology by *C. J. Nitzsch*, System der christlichen Lehre, Bonn, 1829, edit. 5th, 1844 [transl. in Clark's Library, Edinb.], and *J. T. Beck*, die christliche Lehrwissenschaft nach den biblischen Urkunden, Stuttg., 1840, i. 1, 1841, i. 2.

[8] From the time of *Schleiermacher*, Theological Encyclopædia was made

a separate branch of theological science, which had its effect also on doctrinal theology.

[8] *Schleiermacher*, and after him *Nitzsch*, *Marheineke*, *Alex. Schweizer*, *Vinet*, *Gaup* [*Palmer*, *Ehrenfeuchter*,] and others, applied scientific treatment to practical theology. This involved a gain for the practical interests of dogmatic theology.

§ 283.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HEGEL, AND THE YOUNG HEGELIANS.

Fichte, J. H., über Gesensatz, Wendepunct und Ziel der heutigen Philosophie, Heidelb., 1832. *Leo*, Die Hegelingen, Halle, 1838. *Zeller's* Theologische Jahrbücher (since 1849.) *C. A. Thilo*, Die Wissenschaftlichkeit der modernen speculativen Theologie in ihren Principien beleuchtet, Leipz., 1851.

Nor did philosophy stand still. The theory of Schelling, first applied to the natural world, with a preponderance of the imaginative element, was transplanted by *Hegel's* dialectic method, in a more definite manner, to the historical and ethical sphere, and was thus brought into a closer connection with the theology of Protestant Germany. The highest place was assigned to the *idea* even in religion, while feelings and abstract conceptions were deferred to a lower province. Here was the principal difference between the system of Hegel and that of Schleiermacher. During the lifetime of the founder of this new philosophical school, *Daub*[2] and *Marheineke*[3] were the only two theologians who decidedly adopted his principles. But after his death his views gained a large number of adherents in the rising generation, among whom, however, so great a difference obtained respecting some of the most important theological questions, that they soon separted into two distinct parties. The one, called the right wing of the school of Hegel,[4] advocates supernaturalistic, or theistic and conservative principles, while the tendency of the other (the left)[5] is of a critical and destructive character. In addition to these there are some others, philosophers as well as theologians, who have struck out a new and independent path for themselves, as well in the philosophical[6] as in the theological sphere.[7] However much these writers differ in their tendencies (to describe which more fully belongs to doctrinal theology, in connection with the philosophy of religion), they for the most part agree in discarding the former antagonism between Rationalism and Supernaturalism, in having regard to the demands of a spirit of inquiry, as well as the wants of faith, and in investigating in a more appreciative manner the doctrines received by the church. Nor do they rest satisfied either with appealing to foreign authority, or with a superficial and partial judgment. And herein is the guarantee for the success of their further efforts.

[1] *Georg Freidrich Wilhelm Hegel*, born 1770, was, from the year 1818, professor of philosophy in the university of Berlin, and died 1831. His entire works were published Berlin, 1832–45, 18 voll. Among them are: Phänomenologie des Geistes, Bamb., 1807. Encyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften, Heidelb., 1817, edit. 4th, 1845. Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion, edited by *Marheineke*, Berlin, 1832, ii.—He also wrote a remarkable preface to *Heinrichs'* Religionsphilosophie, 1822 (in respect to the religious sentiment.)—Concerning the latest controversies see *H. Leo*, die Hegelingen, Halle, 1838, 39. *Kahnis*, Ruge und Hegel, Quedl., 1838. *Rheinwald*, Repertorium, xxxi. p. 28, ss. [On Hegel, see New American Cyclopedia, sub voce. His works and life are described in *Rosenkranz*, Hegel's Leben, 1844. In English have appeared his Philosophy of History, by *Sibree*, in Bohn's Library, 1857; his Subjective Logic, by *Sloman* and *Wallon*, 1855. In French, his Aesthetics by *Bénard*, 5 vols., 1840–52; his Logic, 2 vols., by *A. Véra*, 1860, who also in 1855 published an Introduction à la Philosophie de Hegel, the fullest account of his system outside of Germany. Among the chief criticisms of his theory in Germany are *Schelling* in his later works; *H. Ulrici*, Ueber Princip und Methode der Hegelschen Philosophie, 1841; *A. Trendelenburg*, Die logische Frage in Hegel's System, and Logische Untersuchungen, 1840; *G. A. Gabler*, Die Hegelsche Philosophie, 1833; *K. P. Fischer*, in his Grundzüge des Systems der Philosophie, 1854, *sq.*; *C. H. Weiss*, Ueber den gegenwärtigen Standpunkt der phil. Wissenschaft, and in other works; *Rosenkranz*, Die logische Idee, 1859–60; *Erdmann*, in Gesch. d. neueren Philos.; *J. H. Fichte*, in his Gründzüge zum Systeme der Philosophie, 3 Bde., 1833–46, etc. *C. L. Michelet*, Schelling und Hegel, 1839. The Hegelian school was represented by the Jahrbücher f. wissenschafliche Kritik, 1827, *sq.*; the left wing, by *Ruge* and the Hallische Jahrbücher, 1838. A new Journal, advocating the system has been started by *C. L. Michelet*, Der Gedanke, 1860. The first vol. contains a full bibliography of the school.—The Zeitschrift f. Phil. und spekul Theol., 1837–48, ed. *I. H. Fichte*, and Zeitschrift f. Phil. und phil. Kritik, ed. by *Ulrici* and others, since 1849, opposes the Hegelian pantheism.]

[2] *Karl Daub*, born 1765, was professor of theology and ecclesiastical counsellor in Heidelberg, and died 1836. He had passed through the entire development of modern philosophy from Kant to Hegel. His works were published by *Marheineke* and *Dittenberger*, Berl., 1838, ss. We mention: Theologumena s. doctrinæ de Relig. Christ. ex Natúra Dei perspecta repetendæ Capita potiora, Heidelb., 1806. Einleitung in das Studium der Dogmatik, aus dem Standpuncte der Religion, ibid., 1810.—Judas Ischariot, oder das Böse im Verhältnisse zum Guten betrachtet, 3 parts, ibid., 1816–19.—Die dogmatische Theologie jetziger Zeit, oder die Selbstsucht in der Wissenschaft des Glaubens, ibid., 1833.—System der christlichen Dogmatik (first part) edit. by *Marheineke* and *Dittenburger*, Berlin, 1841. Comp. (*Strauss*) Daub und Schleiermacher in his Charakteristiken u. Kritiken, Lpz., 1839. *Rosenkranz*, Erinnerungen an K. Daub, Berlin, 1837. [*W. Herrmann*, Die speculative Theologie in ihrer Entwicklung durch Daub dargestellt, Hamburgh, 1847.] Among the disciples of Daub (in part too,

of Schleiermacher) a new path in theology has been struck out by *Richard Rothe* of Heidelberg, in his Theologische Ethik, Wittenb., 1845, 2 Bde. [Compare his articles Zur Dogmatik, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1859–60.]

[3] *Philip Marheineke*, born 1780, was professor of theology in the university of Berlin, and died 1846. He wrote: Grundlinien der christlichen Dogmatik als Wissenschaft, Berlin, 1819, 1827. [Theol. Vorlesungen, ed. *Matthies* und *Vatke*, 5 Bde., 1847, *sq.*]

[4] *Gabler*, *Göschel*, *Rosenkranz*, *Schaller*, *Rothe*. See *Thilo*, u. s.

[5] *D. F. Strauss*, die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft dargestellt, ii. Stuttg., 1840, 41. Comp. *K. Ph. Fischer*, die speculative Dogmatik von Strauss, erster Band, geprüft, Tub., 1841. *Thilo*, ubi supra. [Comp. *Rosenkranz*. Kritik d. Strauss'schen Glaubenslehre, 1845. *Kahnis*, Die moderne Wissenschaft des Dr. Strauss, and die wissenschaftliche Basis der Strauss'schen Dogmatik, 1842. *Sartorius*, Die christliche Glaubenslehre; Beurtheilung der Straussischen Dogmatik, 1842.—In more recent times, this tendency has been most ably advocated by Tübingen, as represented by *Ferdinand Christian Baur*, born 1792, died 1860, at first a disciple of Schleiermacher, and by degrees applying the principles of the Hegelian system to the reconstruction of Christian history and of Christian doctrines. Among his works are Christian Gnosis, 1835; replies to Mohler's Symbolism, 1836, *sq.*; History of the Trinity, 3 vols., 1843–5; History of the Atonement, 1838; History of Doctrines, 1847, 1858. *Schwegler* and *Zeller* are his chief disciples. Comp. Baur's work on the Tübingen School, 2d ed., 1860, and *Karl Hase*, Die Tübinger Schule, 1855. *A. Hilgenfeld*, Das Urchristenthum. Hengstenberg's Evang. Kirchenzeitung, 1846; *Keyser*, Rev. de Theologie, 1856; *Uhlhorn* in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1858 (transl. into French by *Sardinoux*, in Revue Chrétienne, Suppl., 1861); Neue Evang. Kirchenzeitung, Jan., 1861; L'Ecole de Tubingue in Revue Germanique, 1861; Christ. Examiner, Boston, 1858. On *Bruno Bauer* and his criticism of the Gospel, see Gutachten d. evang. Theol. Facultäten, Berl., 1842.]

[6] Among those who lived during the period of Kant and Fichte we may mention *Reinhold*, *Fries*, *Krug*, *Bouterweck*, and others; in modern times, *Ritter*, *I. H. Fichte*, *C. H. Weisse*, *K. Ph. Fischer*, *Billroth*, *Erdmann*, *Drobisch*, and others. [The school of Herbart is contending with that of Hegel for supremacy, on the opposite (viz., a realistic) basis; (revival of the doctrine of monads?) *J. F. Herbart*, b. 1776, Prof. in Göttingen, d. 1841. Works, ed. by *Hartenstein*, 12 vols., Lpz., 1850–52; Minor Philos. Works, with biography, by *Hartenstein*, 3 vols., 1841–3. Among his disciples are *M. W. Drobrich*, Prof. in Leipz., Religionsphil., 1840, Math. Psychologie, 1845, etc.; *Gustav Hartenstein*, Metaphysik, 1836; Ethik, 1844; *G. F. Tante*, Religionsphil., 1840–52; *F. Exner*, d. 1853, Psychologie der Hegelschen Schule, 1843–5; *Theod. Waitz*, Psychologie, 1849; *F. H. Allihn*, Verderbliche Einfluss d. hegelschen Phil., etc.; *E. A. Thilo*, Moderne Rechtsphil., 1860; *Rob. Zimmermann*, Prof. in Wien, etc. The school is represented by the Zeitschrift f. d. exacte Philosophie, ed. by *Allihn* and *Zeller*, 1860.]

[7] The principles of Schleiermacher were adopted, though with a stronger

leaning towards orthodox theology, by *Nitzsch* (comp. § 282, note 7), and *A. D. Ch. Twesten*, Vorlesungen über die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche. ii., Hamb., 1826, edit. 3d, 1834. On the other hand, *Carl Hase* allowed to critical and speculative tendencies a greater influence: see his Lehrbuch der evangelischen Dogmatik, Stuttg., 1826; fourth improved edition, 1850; Gnosis, oder evangelische Glaubenslehre für die Gebildeten in der Gemeinde, Leipzig, 1827, ii.—The most recent systems of theology are *J. T. Beck*, 1850; *Rothe*, Ethik, 1845–6; *Julius Müller* [Lehre von der Sunde, 2 Bde., 4th ed., 1838; transl. in Clark's Edinb. Library]; *Liebner* (Christologie, Bd. i.), 1849; *J. P. Lange*, 1849–51 [Christliche Dogmatik, i., Phil. Dogmatik, ii., Positive, iii., Angewandte]; *Martensen*, 1850–6 [from the Danish into German]; *Ebrard*, 1851–2 [Christliche Dogmatik; *F. A. Philippi*, Kirchliche Glaubenslehre, 3 Bde., Stuttg., 1854–9, to be continued; *J. C. K. Hofmann*, Der Schriftbeweis, ein theologischer Versuch, 3 Bde. Nördlingen, 1852, *sq.*, 2d ed., 1859; *G. Thomasius*, Christi Person und Werk, 3 vols., 1853–9; *Daniel Schenkel*, Die christl. Dogmatik vom Standpunkte des Gewissens, 2 Bde., 1859–60; *Ch. H. Weisse*, Philosophische Dogmatik, 2 Bde. 1855–60, and others.] Though representing different tendencies, yet these have as a common aim, to give a philosophical basis to the Biblical and orthodox system of faith, and thus to conquer rationalism by spiritual supremacy.

That tendency which endeavored to bring about a reconciliation between the two extremes was, at first, chiefly represented in the Theologische Zeitschrift, edited by *Schleiermacher*, *De Wette*, and *Lücke*, and afterwards in the *Studien und Kritiken*, edited by *Ullmann* and *Umbreit* (from the year 1828).—There have since been several other periodicals of this class, particularly the Zeitschrift f. christliche Wissenschaft und christ. Leben [founded by *Neander*, *Nitzsch*, *Müller*, *Tholuck*, and others], from 1850: the Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theologie, by *Liebner*, *Ehrenfeuchter* [*Dorner*], etc., Stuttg., 1856.—The organ of the more advanced Hegelian party is the Theologische Jahrbücher, since 1842, by *Baur*, *Zeller* [now the Zeitschrift f. wissenschaftliche Theologie, ed. by *Hilgenfeld*.]

§ 284.

THE LATEST RATIONALISTIC REACTION.

After the destructive tendency, in its self-delusion, had advanced even to the denial and dissolution of the religious self-consciousness,[1] the modern *Rationalismus vulgaris* came forward with all its claims to become a religion for the people, fitted to the wants of the times, and denuded as far as possible of all dogmas; in short, to be for the people what, it said, religion had long been for a great part of educated minds. This was the aim of the so-called *Protestant Friends*, or *Friends of Light* (*Lichtfreunde*),[2] started in Köthen, who obtained adherents in different countries, especially in the north of Germany, and were soon divided up into several branch unions, and free churches.[3] For the development of the History of Doctrines they have only a negative importance, and

their place is rather in the transient story of the day than in the earnest history of religious truth. Of far greater moment is the struggle on fundamental principles, which has again sprung up between the conservative ecclesiastical party and the party of progress, as represented by *Stahl* and *Bunsen*.[4]

[1] *Ludwig Feuerbach*, Das Wesen des Christenthums, Lpz., 1841 (in the service of a pneumatic water-cure!); Das Wesen der Religion, 2te. Aufl., 1850. [Essence of Christianity, transl. by *Marian Evans*. Lond., New York, 1855. "Religion is a dream of the human mind;" "all theology is anthropology," etc. Feuerbach has also written Charakteristiken des modernen Afterchristenthums; *P. Bayle*, 1838; Philos. und Christenthums, 1839; Leibnitzsche Philosophie, 1837, etc.]

[2] *Uhlich* and *Wislicenus*.—A meeting was held in Köthen, May 29, 1844. Wislicenus work, Ob Schrift, ob Geist, 1845.—Thirteen Articles.—*Uhlich's* Reformation Theses.—See *Niedner*, Kirchengesch., p. 890, who gives the titles of the works.—Another controversy was that of *Dulon* in Bremen; compare the Votum of the Heidelberg faculty, drawn up by *Schenkel*, 1852.

[3] Societies in Breslau and Königsberg. *Rupp*, after his exclusion from the Free Church was a preacher of the Free Evangelical Church in Königsberg. See *Niedner*, as above. [*Hase*, p. 589.]

[4] *Bunsen*, Zeichen der Zeit, Leipz., 1855; Gott in der Geschichte, 3 Bde., Leipz., 1857. These works gave rise to a controversy.—The Protestantische Kirchenzeitung, edited by *H. Krause*, may be considered as the organ of the freer Protestant tendency, introduced by Schleiermacher. [*Christian Charles Josias Bunsen*, d. 1791, ambassador in England, 1841–53, died Nov. 28, 1860. Among his works are, history of the Passion and Still Week, 1841; Church of the Future, 1845, translated, 1847; Eygpt's Place in Universal Hist., 4 vols., English by *Cottrel*, 1848–60; Ignatius, 1847; Hippolytus and his Age, 4 vols., 1855, and then 6 vols., 1854, *sq.* (in English, 2 in German, 1852, *sq.*); Signs of the Times, transl.; Bible Work, not completed, 8 parts, 1858–60. Comp. *B. Baehring*, Bunsen's Bibelwerk, und seine Bedeutung für die Gegenwart, Lpz., 1861. *H. Gelzer*, Bunsen als Staatsman und Schriftsteller, Gotha, 1861.—*Frederick Julius Stahl*, Prof. in Erlangen, called to Berlin, 1841. Works: Protestantische Kirchenverfassung; Rechtsphilosophie. Leading the party of the reaction, he has been involved in controversies on Protestantism and Catholicism, on the Union (advocating the claims of High Lutheranism), and against the Evangelical Alliance: Was ist die Revolution, 3te, Aufl., 1852: Der Protestantismus als politisches Princip., 4te., Aufl., 1853; Die katholischen Widerlegungen, 1854; Christl. Toleranz, 1855; Wider Bunsen, 1856 (*Schenkel*, Für Bunsen, Wider Stahl); Der Christl. Staat, 1858; Die Lutherische Kirche und die Union, 1859, 2te. Aufl., 1860.]

§ 285.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCH AND DOCTRINE OUTSIDE OF GERMANY.

The doctrinal controversies related in the preceding sections (§ 279–284), were almost entirely confined to Protestant Germany, and partially affected Denmark and those parts of Reformed Switzerland, in which the German language is spoken.[1] Nearly all the other Protestant countries either took no notice of these conflicts, or formed erroneous and onesided opinions concerning them.[2] Lutheran orthodoxy maintained on the whole its ground in Sweden.[3] In the Netherlands, the advocates of a more moderate (Arminian) tendency opposed the rigid system of the orthodoxy, established in the canons of the Synod of Dort.[4] In England there were some partial deviations from the 39 Articles;[5] and some new sects sprung up.[6] The theology called *Puseyism*, nurtured in the university of Oxford, tended in both worship and dogma towards the Catholic Church; distinguishing however between the genuine Catholic and the Roman Catholic.[7]—The Evangelical Alliance, started in London in 1846, is a grand attempt to do away with the ecclesiastical and dogmatic dissensions; but German theology can hardly be satisfied with its formal articles.[8]—Nor did Protestant theology in France keep pace with the German culture (with the exception of Strasburg);[9] the laity were here the first to display a spirit of more profound inquiry into religious truths.[10] The commotions in the Church of Geneva and the Canton de Vaud cannot be compared (either as to matter, or to form) with the contests between Rationalism and Supernaturalism in Germany.[11] But the barriers which have hitherto prevented foreign churches from appropriating the results of German learning seem gradually disappearing, and a growing desire manifests itself to become acquainted with the religious conflicts of the birth-place of the Reformation.

[1] In Denmark the controversy between Rationalism and Supernaturalism was carried on by *Clausen* and *Grundtvig* (see the Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, 1827, etc. Studien und Kritiken, 1834, part 4; *Hase*, Church History, pp. 525, 526, 561–2.) [*Rudelbach*, in Zeitschrift f. lutherische Theologie, 1841; and, more fully, 1859–60, in opposition to the later high church Lutheranism of Grundtvig. Among the Reformed Churches of Switzerland in the last century, Zurich was especially affected by the theological tendencies then prevailing in Germany. (*Hess* and *Lavater* were the representatives of Supernaturalism, though each in a different way—*Häfeli*, *Stols*, and *Schulthess*, of Rationalism.) The theology of Schleiermacher in the course of this century was here represented by *L. Usteri*, the author of the

"Paulinischer Lehrbegriff," which in the later editions inclines to the views of *Hegel* and *Rosenkranz;* and *Alexander Schweizer*, [author of the Glaubenslehre der Reform. Kirche, 2 Bde., 1844, and Central-Dogmen der Reform. Kirche, 2 Bde., 1854–6; an advocate of strict necessity as the inmost sense of the Reformed theology. The call of *Strauss* to Zurich, 1839, led to a violent controversy, and the call was revoked. See *Gelzer*, Die Straussischen Zerwürfnisse in Zürich, 1843; *Aug. Roden*, Geschichte der Berufung des Dr. Strauss, 1840.]—In Schaffhausen, *Georg Müller*, (died 1819; he wrote: Vom Glauben der Christen, Winthurthur, 1815, 2 vols.) endeavoured to propagate principles akin to those of Herder, but in a more orthodox sense. In Berne, orthodoxy long maintained its ground in alliance with the aristocratic government.—Since the expulsion of the first representative of Rationalism (*Wettstein*, 1730) from Basle, its advocates have always been excluded from that town. For a long time it was (unjustly) considered the seat of pietism.—By the renovation and foundation of the Swiss universities (Basle, 1817–35, Zurich, 1833, Berne, 1834), and the vocation of German professors (*De Wette* received a call from the university of Basle, 1821), the theology of Switzerland was brought into a closer connection with that of Germany.

[2] *J. H. Rose*, der Zustand der protestantischen Religion in Deutschland, 4 Reden an der Univ. Cambridge, 1825, translated from the English, Leipz., 1826. [*Hugh James Rose*, b. 1795, d. 1838, State of Protestantism in Germany, 2d ed., 1829; comp. Edinb. Rev., vol. 54, and *E. B. Pusey's* Historical Inquiry, 2 vols., 1828–30.]

[3] See *Guericke*, Kirchengeschichte, ii., p. 1084, 1087.

[4] Concerning the latest events, see Die Unruhen in der niederländisch-reformirten Kirche während der Jahre, 1833–39, von X. herausg. von *Gieseler*, Hamb., 1840. Among the Dutch theologians *Heringa*, *Clarisse*, *Royaards*, and others have followed the development of German theology. [*J. Clarisse*, Encyclop. Theol., 1835. *J. Ez. Heringa*, Opera Exeg., new ed., 1845; Het gebruiken misbruik der Kritik, 1793. *H. J. Royaards*, Chrest. Patrist., 1831, 7; Comp. Hist. Eccles., 1840; Geschiedenis van het Christendom Nederland, 1853. *D. Van Wijnpersse*, on Div. of Christ, 1793. *H. Muntinghe*, d. 1824, Theologia Theoret.; Brevis Expos. Vet. Fœderis, 1827. —The present divisions of the schools in Holland are, 1. Strict orthodox, at the Hague, represented by *Groen van Prinsterer*, *Capadose*, the poet *Bilderjik*, (d. 1831). 2. Moderate orthodox, under the motto, Earnestness and Peace. *Chantepie de la Saussaye*, has written on the Religious Crisis in Holland, in defence of their views (Paris, 1860) against Prinsterer: Domine *Beets*, *Helldring*, *Hasenbroek*, *Van Rhyn*, *Van Osterzee*, *Doedes* and *Trottet*, (see his article on Dutch theology, in the Rev. Christ., 1860) also belong here. 3. The school of Groningen (moderate liberal); *Van Heusde* (the Platonist, d. 1845), *Hofstede de Groot*, etc. 4. Rationalists, chiefly at Leyden. Prof. *Scholten*, of Leyden in his "Doctrine of Ref. Church" and "History of Philos. of Religion" is "deistico-pantheistic." *Opzoomer* of Utrecht would reconcile man with himself by means of philosophy. See *Von Prinsterer*, The Anti-Revolutionary Party, Amst., 1860; *Chantepie*, La Crise

Rélig., 1860. *Réville*, Les Controverses en Hollande, in Rev. des deux Mondes, 1860, translated in Christ. Exam., Boston, 1861.]

[5] Thus the principles of Arianism propounded by *Samuel Clarke*, (died 1729) at the commencement of the present period, were adopted by some. [See above § 234, p. 213, and § 262, p. 332.] *Howe* [Sherlock?] was accused of tritheism.—Among the English divines in North America, *Edwards* is the most distinguished. His chief works are on the Freedom of the Will, and on Original sin. [Comp. § 285, *b*.]

[6] The rise of new sects both in England and the United States of America is of no importance for the history of doctrines [:]. The greatest sensation was made by *Irving* (1792–1834), whose views gained some adherents even on the continent. See *Hohl*, Bruchstücke aus dem Leben und den Schriften Ed. Irvings, St. Gallen, 1839. [*Edward Irving*, b. 1792, d. 1834. Works: Oracles of God, 3d ed., 1834; Coming of Messiah, 2 vols., 1827; Babylon and Infidelity foredoomed, 1826; The Last Days, 1850; Sermons, 3 vols., 1828; Homilies on Sacraments, i., 1828; Exposition of Book of Revelation, 4 vol., 1831; Orthodox and Catholic Doctrine of our Lord's Human Nature, 1831. Proceedings of London Presb. in his Case, 1831. Irving and his adversaries in Fraser's Magaz., 14; Death of Irving, by *Thos. Carlyle*, ibid., vol. 11; Trial of Irving, Niles's Register, vol. 44. See also Ecl. Mag., 14; Meth. Quar., 9; Christ. Exam. (by *Lamson*), 3; Christ. Month. Spec., 6; English Review, 1848; Studien und Kritiken, 1849; Schaff's Kirchenfreund, 1850. *Jacobi*, Lehre d. Irvingiten, 1853. *Geo. Pilkington*, The Tongues proved to be English, Spanish, Latin, 1831. The First and Last Days of the Church of Christ, from the French of *C. M. Carre*, by *M. N. M. Hume*, Lond.—Liturgy and Litany, Lond. and New York, 1856. On the revival of the apostolate in the United States, and the church as it is here, compare: *W. W. Andrews*, True Constitution of Church, 1854. Apostles Given, Lost and Restored, 1855. [*J. S. Davenport*] The Permanency of the Apostolic Office, 1853. See also Chronicle of Certain Events, 1826–52. Lond., 1852.]

[7] The first traces of this tendency date from about 1820; the British Magazine, 1832; the Tracts for the Times, 1833 sq. The Catholic tendency advanced till 1841. Chief representatives, *Dr. Pusey* in Oxford, (b. 1800), *T. Keble*, *J. H. Newman*, who went over to the Catholic church. Comp. *Weaver*, Der Puseyismus in seinen Lehren und Tendenzen, from the English, by *Amthor*, Leipz., 1845. *Fock* in Schwegler's Jahrbücher der Gegenwart, Aug., 1841. *Bruns* and *Häfner's* Repertorium, May and July, 1846. Allg. Berlin. Kirchenzeitung, 1846. (*Niedner*, Kirchengeschichte, p. 867.) Allg. Augsburg, Zeitung, 1847, No. 46, Beilage. [See next section.]

[8] See Der Evangel Bund, von *K. Mann* and *Theod. Platt*, Basel, 1847. [Annual Reports of the Alliance, particularly that of the Berlin Meeting, 1857, by *Ed. Steane*.]

[9] *Blessig*, *Hafner*, *Emmerich*, *Kienlen*, *Bruch*, *Reuss*, *Redslob*, *C. Schmid*.

[10] *Benj. Constant*, *Cousin*, *Guizot*. Among the theologians we mention: *Vincent* of Nismes (Méditations et Discours, 1830, ss.), *Vinet*, died 1847, *Merle d'Aubigné*, *Gaussen*, *Sardinoux*. *Periodicals*: Ami de la Religion,

Semeur; Lien (organ of a moderate liberalism); Espérance (moderate church orthodoxy); Archives du Christianisme (organ of Dissenters); Avenir (organ of the Free Church). See *Ullmann*, Polenische Erörterungen, in Stud. und Kritiken, 1852. *H. Reuchlin*, Das Christenthum in Frankreich, Hamb., 1837.

[11] The formal aspect of the controversy respecting revelation was not at all mentioned. The opponents of the so-called Momiers (*Chénevière*, and others) may be said to hold Supernaturalistic principles, inasmuch as, proceeding from the doctrine of inspiration and the integrity of the canon, they found *their* dogmas upon Scripture (like the Socinians). That Arianism (!) could issue from this shows the difference of French and German Rationalism. Comp. the works of *Chénevière*, *Bost*, *Malan*. Histoire véritable des Momiers, Par., 1824. Basle, 1825. With this work compare: *De Wette*, Einige Bemerkungen über die kirchlichen Bewegungen in Genf (Basler wissenschatiche Zeitschrift, iii. part 2, p. 33 ss.); and "Genfs Kirchliche und Christliche Zustände," by a theologian of French Switzerland, in the Zeitschrift für christl. Wissenschaft, 1850, No. 30–34. –The Darbyites and Irvingites have also made disciples in Switzerland. On the former see *J. Herzog*, Les Frères de Plymouth et John Darby, Lausanne, 1845: on the latter, see § 302, Note 4. A controversy on the inspiration of the Scripture was started by *Scherer*, in Geneva: a new French school on this basis, has its organ in *Colani's* Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, Strasb., since 1850.

[The power of the materialistic school of philosophy in France was broken by the Lectures of *Laroniguière*, 1811–12; of *Royer-Collard*, on the basis of Reid; by *Maine de Biran*, d. 1824; and especially by *Victor Cousin*, 1828 sq., in his System of Eclecticism, followed by *Jouffroy* (d. 1848), and others. A philosophical deism is inculcated by *Jules Simon*. *Auguste Comte's* (d. 1857) Positive Philosophy makes induction the only philosophical process. The Eclectic school was opposed by *Ledru Rollin*, and by the Catholic traditionalists: it is represented in the Dictionnaire des Sciences philosophiques, 4 vols. *Cousin's* Psychology, by *C. S. Henry*, 4th ed., New York, 1856; on the True, Beautiful and Good, by *O. W. Wight*, 1852; Lectures on Kant, by *Henderson*, Lond., 1854. *Hamilton* on Cousin in Edinb. Rev., 50 (and in his Discussions). Comp. North Am. Rev., 29; President *Day*, in Christ. Spec., 1835; Princeton Review, 1856. *Fuchs*, Kritik, Berlin, 1848. *H. Taine*, in Philos. Françaises, 1857. *Rosenkranz*, in Zeitschrift f. Philos., 23.—*Jouffroy's* Introd. to Ethics, transl. by *W. H. Channing*, 2 vols., Bost., 1840.—*Jules Simon*, Le Devoir, 2me. ed., 1854. La Religion Naturelle, 1857, transl. Lond. On *Maine de Biran*, see *Astié*, in Am. Theol. Rev., 1859.—On *Comte*, see *Harriet Martineau's* exposition, 2 vols., 1854; Lewes', 1853; Christ. Examiner (by *Thos. Hill*), 1854; Princeton Rev., 1856, 1858; Methodist Quart., a series of articles, 1852 sq.; British Quart., 1854, 1858. *Robinet*, Notice sur la Vie de Comte, Paris, 1860.]

[Madame *de Krudener*, 1814, in Pays de Vaud, helped to revive religious belief; the party called Momiers. The *Haldanes* in Geneva. The Société Evangelique, 1831. *Malan* on Justification: tracts and hymns. *Merle*

d'Aubigné, Hist. of Reformation. *Gaussen*, Theopneustia, transl. by *Kirk* new ed., Bost., 1860. A more liberal tendency was represented by *Alex. Vinet*, Essai sur les manifestations des convictions religieuses, 2d ed., 1859, (on separation of Church and State) transl. by *C. T. Jones*, 1843: Essais de Philosophie morale, 1837; Pastoral Theol. and Homiletics, transl. by *T. H. Skinner*, N. Y., 1854: Moralistes des xvi^e^. et xvii^e^. Siècles, 1859; Histoire de la Prédication, etc., 1861. Comp. *Astié's* Esprit de Vinet, 1860. *Agénor de Gasparin*, School of Doubt, and School of Faith, etc.—The Revue Chrètienne, published in Paris since 1853, edited by Ed. de Pressensé, represents substantially the school of Vinet.—Besides his work on Inspiration, *Scherer* has also written on the Church, and Mélanges de critique réligieuses, 1861; he represents an extreme rationalistic tendency. *Ed. de Pressensé*, Histoire des trois premiers Siècles de l'Eglise, 2 Tomes, 1858.—French Protestantism has of late years shown an increased zeal in rescuing its early history from neglect; see the Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du Protestantisme Franç., 1852 sq.: the histories of *De Félice*, *Soldan*, and *Puaux*; the republication of Calvin's works in French, etc.]

§ 285, *a*.

THEOLOGY IN ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

[The moderate theology of the divines of Queen Anne's reign, the ethical tendencies of the Latudinarians (see § 225, *b*), and the general disposition, in the contest with infidelity, to reduce Christianity to its lowest terms, perpetuated, through the larger part of the eighteenth century, an indifference to thorough theological discussion. High Church principles were still inculcated by the Non-jurors[1], who however were excluded from any general influence. As the result of the Bangor controversy,[2] the powers of the church in Convocation were annulled. The succession of Anglican divinity was kept up through the century, by the archbishops,[3] *Potter*, *Secker*, and *Laurence*; *Thos. Burnet*, master of the Charter-House;[4] the bishops *Tomline*, *Thos. Newton*, and *Thos. Wilson*; *Stackhouse*, *Skelton* and *Worthington*; bishops *Halifax*, *Horsley*, *Hurd* and *Watson*; and carried into the next century by bishops *Burgess*, *Van Mildert*, and *Mant*.[5] *Warburton*[6] was the most learned and vigorous polemic of the period. The theological system of *Hey*, the ethics and evidences of *Paley*, and to some extent the Arminianism of *John Taylor*, gave the tone to the popular religious discourse.[7] In *William Law*, Bishop *Edmund Law*, and *Jones* of Nayland, were found a more earnest religious spirit.[8] Biblical learning was represented by Abp. *Newcome*, *Pococke*, *Robert Lowth*, *Kennicott*, *Horne*, *Bootlroyd*, *Parkhurst* and *Herbert Marsh*.[9] *Hutchinsonianism*[10] was a peculiar and transient attempt to show that all nature is symbolical of divine truth. Calvinism[11] was still defended

in the established church by *Toplady* and *Scott ;* but its chief advocates were found among the non-conformists,[12] *Ridgley*, *Watts*, *Doddridge*, *Gill* and *Williams*. The Unitarian controversy in this and the next century was continued between *Priestley* and *Horsley*, *Belsham*, and *Pye Smith*, and others.[13] Subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Athanasian Creed was defended on grounds of expediency.[14]]

[Metaphysics were discarded, and mental philosophy was taught on the law of association by *Hartley ;* on the principles of common sense by *Tucker ;* on the basis of materialism by *Priestley*.[15] The idealism of *Berkeley*[16] is an isolated phenomenon. Bishop *Butler*[17] established the ethical system on a purer basis, and *Price* vindicated an independent morality.[18]]

[1] [Abp. Sancroft and two other bishops refused the oath of allegiance, 1688.—Scottish bishops joined them. The Non-jurors were divided, 1720, on the question of prayers for the dead, and the eucharistic sacrifice. Their Liturgy was revised, 1765. After the death of the Pretender, Charles Edward, they acknowledged George III., and in 1792 were released from the penal laws. The last of the non-juring bishops was *Boothe*, who died in Ireland, 1805. Among their divines were *Nathl. Spinckes* (d. 1727), *Hickes*, *Kettlewell*, *Leslie*, *John Johnson*, *Ken*, *Dodwell*, *Francis Lee*, *Wm. Law*, *Thos. Brett*. See *Thos. Lathbury's* Hist. of Non-jurors, Lond., 1845; *Bowles*, Life of Bp. *Ken*, 2 vols., 1830; another Life by a Layman, 1851; comp. Dublin Rev., July, 1853. On their consecration, see Appendix to *Percival's* Apology for Apostol. Succession. Comp. *Macaulay's* Hist., vol. iv. and Notes and Queries, 2d s. xi. 232.]

[2] [The Bangor Controversy, 1717 *sq.*, was called forth by a sermon of the Latitudinarian *Hoadly*, Bp. of Bangor (1715–1761: Works, 3 vols., 1763), maintaining that the established church is a human institution; opposed by Drs. *Snape*, *Sherlock*, and others; the Convocation was prorogued, and has had, until within the past few years, merely a formal being. On *Law's* Letter to *Hoadly*, see below, note 7. Works on Convocation, see ante, p. 295. *P. Skelton*, Vindication of Hoadly, Works, v. 211–251.]

[3] [*John Potter*, Abp. Canterb., b. 1674, d. 1747. Theol. Works, 3 vols., Oxf., 1753; on Church Government, reprinted in Tracts of Angl. Fathers, vol. iii.; Archæologia Græca, 2 vols., 1797–99; editions of Lycophron and Clemens Alexandrinus.—*Thos. Secker*, Abp. Cant., from 1758 to 1768. Works, 12 vols., Lond., 1770; Life by Bp. *Porteus*: Lectures on Catechism (Works, vols. 10, 11).—*Richard Laurence*, Abp. of Cashel, b. 1760, d. 1839; Bampton Lectures, 1804 (3d ed., 1838), on the Articles termed Calvinistic; on Baptismal Regeneration, 3d ed., 1838; Documents on Predestination Controversy, 1819; Ascensio Isaiæ, 1819; Book of Enoch, transl., 1821; on Griesbuch's Classification of MS., 1814.]

[4] [*Thos. Burnet*, Master of the Charter-House, b. 1635, d. 1715. He led the way in modern cosmogony by his Telluris Theoria Sacra, 4 Books, 1681–89, popularised in his Sacred Theory of the Earth, 7th ed., 2 vols.,

1759; De Statu Mortuorum et Resurgentium, transl. (with an answer to al the Heresies therein) by *M. Earbery*, 2d ed., 2 vols., Lond., 1738 (advocates the Millennium and the limited duration of future punishment): Archæologiæ Philos., 1692, transl. by Foxton, 1729, etc.—*Thomas Burnet*, Prebend. of Salisbury, d. 1750: The Demonstration of True Religion (Bayle's Lect., 1724–5), 2 vols., Lond., 1726; the Argument in Christ. as old as Creation, 3 parts, 1730–2.]

[5] [*George Pretyman*, (his name changed to *Tomline*, 1803), Bp. Lincoln, b. 1750, d. 1827: Elements of Christ. Theol., 2 vols., 2d ed. 1779, and often since; Refutation of Calvinism, 1811, etc.—*Thos. Newton*, Bp. of Bristol, b. 1704, d. 1782; Dissertation on Prophecies, 10th ed., 2 vols., 1804; dissertations on theol. topics; Works, 6 vols., 1787.—*Thos. Wilson*, Bp. of Sodor and Man), b. 1663, d. 1755: Works, 4th ed., 4 vols., 1796–7; new edition by *Keble*, in Angl. Cath. Library; on Lord's Supper, and Sacra Privata, frequent editions; Life by *Hugh Stowell*, 3d ed., 1829.—*Thos. Stackhouse*, b. 1680, d. 1752: Complete Body of Div., 3d ed. fol., 1755; Apostles' Creed, 1747; New Hist. of Bible, 6 vols., 1767, 3, 4to, ed. *Gluig*, 1817; on Woolston, 1760.—*Philip Skelton*, see § 276, p. 385.—*Wm. Worthington*, b. 1703, d. 1778; Essay on Redemption, 1743; Boyle Lects., 1766–8, on Evidence of Christ (as growing), 2 vols., 1769; Script. Theory of the Earth (anon.), 1773.—*Saml. Halifax*, Bp. St. Asaph, b. 1733, d. 1790, On Justification, 2d ed., 1762; on Prophecy, 1776.—*John Rotheram*, Rector of Houghton-le-Spring, d. 1788, Apology for Athanasian Creed; Essay on Human Liberty, 1782; Argument for Prophecy (against Middleton), Oxf., 1753.—*Samuel Horsley*, Bp. St. Asaph, b. 1733, d. 1806: Collected Works, 6 vols. 1845; Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley, 3d ed., 1812; ed. Newton's Works, 5 vols., 1779–85; Biblical Criticisms. See *Allibone's* Dict. i. 894.—*Richard Hurd*, Bp. Worcester, b. 1720, d. 1808; Works, 8 vols., 1811, chiefly literary criticism.—*Richard Watson*, Bp. Llandaff, b. 1737, d. 1816: Apology for Bible, against Paine, 2d ed., 1796; Collection of Theol. Tracts, 6 vols., 1791; Miscel. Tracts, 2 vols., 1815.—*Thos. Burgess*, Bp. Salisbury, b. 1756, d. 1837: First Principles, 1804; Origin and Independence of Ancient Brit. Church, 2d ed., 1815; English Ref. and Papal Schism, 1829; Tracts on Div. of Christ (see note 13 of previous section); Life by *Harford*, 2d ed., 1841.—*William Van Mildert*, Bp. of Durham, b. 1765, d. 1836: Theol. Works, 6 vols., Oxf., 1838; Boyle Lect. on Progress of Infidelity, 2 vols.; Bampton Lectures on Religious Controversy, 1814; Sermons.—*Richard Mant*, Bp. Down, b. 1776, d. 1849: Appeal to Gospel (against the charges of Methodists), Bampton Lect., 1812; Churches of Rome and England, 1837; Hist. Chh. Ireland, 1840; Horæ Liturgicæ, 1845.]

[6] [*William Warburton*, Bp. of Gloucester, see ante, p. 384; besides the works there mentioned, he wrote Alliance between Church and State (Works, vol. 7); Doctrine of Holy Spirit (in vol. 6); Critical and Philos. Commentary on Pope's Essay on Man.]

[7] [*John Hey*, b. 1754, Norrisan Prof. Div., Camb., 1780, d. 1815 ("acute, impartial, and judicious;" *Kaye*): Lectures on Divinity, 4 vols., 1796, 3d ed. *Turton*, 2, 1841; Essay on Redemption; Thoughts on Athanasian Creed,

1790.—*William Paley*, Archd. of Carlisle, see ante, p. 384. His Natural Theology illustrated by *Brougham* and *Bell*, 5 vols., 1835–39. His selfish theory of morals opposed by Mackintosh, Stewart, Coleridge, Whewell, and most of the later English moralists.—*John Taylor*, of Norwich, a Unitarian divine, b. 1694, d. 1761; Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin, 1738, 4th ed., with Reply to Wesley, 1767; Paraphrase to Epistle to Romans, 3d ed., 1754; Script. Doctrine of Atonement, 1753; Hebrew Concordance, after *Buxtorf*, 2 fol. Norwich, 1754–7.]

[8] [*William Law*, a non-juror and mystic, b. 1686, d. 1761: Works, 9 vols., 1762. His Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor (*Hoadly*) are famed in controversial literature for wit and argument. Remarks on Mandeville's Fable of Bees, 3d, 1762; Case of Reason (against *Tindal*); Practical Treatise on Christ. Perfection, 5th ed., 1759; Grounds and Reasons of Christ. Regeneration, 7th ed., 1773; Serious Call, 1st ed., 1729, often republished; in the deistic controversy, reply to Dr. Trapp, 4th ed., 1772, etc.; he prepared in part an edition of Behmen's works, 1764–81, and published on them, The Way to Divine Knowledge, 2d ed., 1762.—*Edmund Law*, Bp. Carlisle, b. 1703, d. 1787: Considerations on the Theory of Religion, 1745, new ed. by *G. H. Law*, Lond., 1820; Inquiry into the Ideas of Space, Time, etc., in Answer to Jackson, 1734; he also transl. *King* on Origin of Evil.—*William Jones*, of Nayland, b. 1726, d. 1800 ("had the talent of writing upon the deepest subjects to the plainest understandings;" *Horsley*); Theol. and Miscel. Works, 6 vols., 1810, 1826; The Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity; Figurative Language of Scriptures; Essay on the Church.]

[9] [*William Newcome*, Abp. Armagh, b. 1729, d. 1800: Harmony of Gospels, 1798, 1802, ed. by *M. Stuart*, Andover, 1814; Ezekiel and Minor Prophets, 1836; Eng. Bible Translations, 1792.—*Samuel Parker*, Bibl. Biblica, 5 fol. on Pent., Oxf., 1720, *sq.*—*Richard Pococke*, Bp. of Meath, b. 1704, d. 1765: Description of the East, 2 fol., 1743–5; Inscript. Antiq. liber., 1752.—*William Romaine*, Calasio's Concordance, 4 vols., 1747 (Hutchinsonian).—*Robert Lowth*, Bp. London, b. 1710, d. 1787: Isaiah, new transl., 13th ed., 1842; De Sacri Poesi Hebræorum Prælectiones, with Notes of Michaelis and Rosenmüller, Oxf., 1821, transl. by *G. Gregory*, 2 vols. 1787, Boston, 1815, new ed., with notes of *C. E. Stowe*, Andov., 1829; Sermons; Letter to Warburton, 2d ed., 1766.—*Benj. Kennicott*, b. 1718, d. 1783: State of Hebrew Text, 2, Oxf., 1753–9; Two Diss. on Tree of Life, etc., 2d ed., 1747; Collection of Hebr. MS., 1770; Diss. in Vet. Test. Hebr., 1780, etc.—*George Horne*, Bp. Norwich, b. 1730, d. 1792. Works, 4 vols., ed. by *Wm. Jones*, Lond., 1809; Comm. on Psalms, frequent editions; Letter on Behmen, and Cautions to Law (Works, i. 216, *sq.*); Discourses. He favored the views of Hutchinson (see next note).—*Benj. Boothroyd* (Independent), minister at Huddersfield, d. 1836: Family Bible and Improved Version, 3, 4to, 1824; Biblia Hebraica.—Critical Comm. and Paraphrase on Old and New Test. and Apocrypha. by *Patrick, Lowth, Arnold, Whitby*, and *Laeman*; new ed. by *Pitman*, 6 vols., 1822.—*Geo. D'Oyly* and *R. Mant*, Notes, etc., Lond., 1845, 3 vols., 8vo.—*John Parkhurst* (Hutchinsonian), b. 1728, d. 1797: Greek and English Lexicon, 1798, often repr., 1851; Hebr. and Eng. Lex., 1792, ed. *Rose*, 1829, *Major*, 1843,

—*Herbert Marsh*, Bp. Petersborough, b. 1757, d. 1839: Authenticity of the First Books of Moses, 1792; Lects. on Criticism and Interpretation, 1838; on Authenticity of N. Test., 1840; Comp. View of the Churches of England and Rome, 1814, 1816; translation of *Michaelis*, Introd., 4 vols. in 6, 1802.—On *Thos. Scott*, see note 11, on *Doddridge* and *Gill*, note 12.]

[10] [*John Hutchinson*, b. 1674, d. 1737: Philosophical and Theol. Works, 12 vols., Lond., 1749; Moses' Principia; Glory or Gravity, etc.) He opposed the Newtonian system. Among his followers were Bishop *Horne*, *Parkhurst*, *Romaine*, and *Jones* of Nayland. See *Horne*, Works, vol. 6, p. 113, *sq.*, on the State of the Case between Sir Isaac Newton and Mr. Hutchinson; and Jones of Nayland, in Preface to Life of Bp. *Horne*. Their leading principle was, that ideas in divinity are formed from the ideas in nature; the Trinity is to be conveyed to the understanding by ideas of sense; the Cherubim represent humanity united to Deity, etc. *Robert Spearman*, publ. an Abstract of Hutchinson's Works, Edinb., 1755; and a Supplement, 1765. *Julius Bate*, Defence of H., 1751.]

[11] [*Augustus Montague Toplady*, b. 1740, d. 1778: Works, 6 vols., 1794, 1825; in one vol. 1853 (a strenuous Calvinist); Historic Proof of Doctrinal Calvinism of Church of England (vol. i. ii.); Church of Eng. vindicated from the Charge of Arminianism; Doctrine of Predestination (vol. v.), Scheme of Necessity against Wesley (vol. vi.)—*Thos. Scott*, b. 1747, d. 1821: Holy Bible with Notes, frequent editions; Works, ed. *John Scott*, 10 vols., 1823; Force of Truth; Essays; Sermons; Synod of Dort, etc.; Evangelical Doctrines stated and defended in Remarks on Bp. of Winchester's (*Tomline*) Refutation of Calvinism (Works, vol. vii. viii.) His son, *John Scott* (d. 1834) published, Inquiry into Effect of Baptism, against Bp. *Mant*, 2d ed., 1817, and against *Laurence*, 1817. (See above § 225, *b*, note 2, p. 184. See on this subject the works of *Tomline* and *Laurence*, and *Ed. Williams* (note 12). Bp. *Herbert Marsh* was also a strenuous opponent of Calvinism. *Thos. Edwards* (Arminian), b. 1729, d. 1785, vicar of Nuneaton, on Irresistible Grace, Cambr., 1759.—*John H. Hinton*, Moderate Calvinism reexamined, Lond. 1861. *Whately's* Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul (Essays, 2d series, 5th ed., 1845). *Copleston* on Predestination and Necessity, 1821.]

[12] [*Thos. Ridgeley*, see above § 225, *b*, p. 191. *Isaac Watts*, b. 1674, d. 1748: Works, 9 vols., Lond., 1812. Sermons; Rational Order of Christ. Church; Doctrines of Trinity; Glory of God as Christ-Man (he held the preexistence of Christ's human soul, as did *Fleming* and *T. Goodwin*); Improvement of the Mind, etc.—*Philip Doddridge*, b. 1702, d. 1751. Family Expositor, numerous editions; Works, 10 vols., 1802; Course of Lectures on Pneumatology, Ethics and Divinity (Works iv.); Sermons; Life and Corresp., 5 vols., Lond., 1831.—*John Gill* (Baptist), b. 1697, d. 1771: Expos. O. and New Test., 9 vols., 4to, Lond., 1810; Solomon's Song, fol., 1728; Complete Body of Divinity, 2, 1839; Cause of God and Truth, new ed., 1838, etc.—*Edward Williams*, b. 1730, taught in Indep. Academy of Rotheram from 1795, d. 1813: Defence of Modern Calvinism (against Tomline) 1812; Essay on Divine Government, 2d ed., 1813, omitting the exam

mation of Whitby and Fletcher; Christian Preacher, 5th ed., 1843; edited Doddridge and Jonathan Edwards, and abridged Owen on Hebrews.]

[18] [*Joseph Priestley*, b. 1733, in America 1794, d. 1804, a voluminous writer on political, philosophical and religious topics. Correspondence with Price on Materialism, 1778; Examination of Reid's Inquiry, 1775; Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion, 2 vols., 2d ed., 1782; Letters to a Phil. Unbeliever (on Hume and Gibbon), 1747; Hist. of Church, 6 vols., 1790–1803. His History of Corruption of Christ, 2 vols., 1782, and Hist. of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ, 4, 1786, led to Horsley's Charge, etc. (see note 5); Tracts in Controversy with Horsley, 1783–6, reprinted 1815. Memoirs to 1795 written by himself, 2 vols., Lond., 1806–7.—*Nathaniel Lardner*, b. 1684, d. 1768: Works, 11 vols., Credibility of Gospel Hist. (17 vols., Lond., 1727–57); Collection of Ancient Jewish and Heathen Testimonies (4 vols., 1764–7); Hist. of Heretics from MS. (1780); Two Schemes of a Trinity considered (Works, x.); on the Logos in Place of the Human Soul of Christ (vol. xi.)—*Theophilus Lindsey*, b. 1723, d. 1808: Apology, 1774, Sequel, 1776; Histl. View of State of Unit. Doctrine from Reformation, 1783; Vindiciæ Priestlieanæ, 1788; Memoirs by *Belsham*, 1812.—*Thos. Belsham*, b. 1730, d. 1809: Calm Inquiry into Script. Doctrine Concerning the Person of Christ (and review of Priestley and Horsley), 1811; Epistles of Paul, 2 vols., 4to, 1822; Appendix of Extracts from divines of Church of England, 1824.—Memoirs by *John Williams*, 1833. New Version of New Test. chiefly by Belsham. (Comp. Magee on Sacrifice, ed. of 1842, vol. 2, pp. 74–311 on this Version; Abp. *Laurence*, Critical Reflections, 1811; *Edward Nares*, Prof. Hist. Oxf., d. 1811, Remarks on the Version, 2d ed., 1814.—*Lant Carpenter*, b. 1780, d. 1840: Examination of the charges against Unitarians, and the Improved Version by Bp. Magee, with Strictures on Bp. Burgess, Drs. Hales, Graves, Nares, Pye Smith, Rennel, etc., Bristol, 1820; he also wrote on the Atonement, 1843; Harmony of Gospels, 2d ed., 1838, etc.—*John Jebb*, M. D., b. 1736, d. 1786. Works by *Disney*, 3 vols., 1787.—*Caleb Fleming*, 1698, d. 1779: a Socinian, he wrote against *Bolingbroke* and *Chubb*, and in favor of pædo-baptism. —*Jos. Bretland*, Unit., b. 1742, d. 1819: Sermons, 2 vols., 1820.—*Abraham Rees*, d. 1825, Sermons, 4, 1809.—*John Disney*, b. 1746, d. 1816: Letters to Dr. *V. Knox*, on Unit. Christians; Remarks on [*Tomline's*] Charge, 1812; Sermons, 4, 1793–1818.—*Richard Price*, b. 1723, d. 1791: Four Diss. on Provid., Christianity, etc., 3d ed., 1772; on Civil Liberty, 9th ed., 1776; Sermons on Christ. Doctrine, 1787.—(On the controversy as to 1 John v. 7, see the treatise of Sir *Is. Newton*, 1754; Bp. *Burgess*, Tracts on Div. of Christ, 1820, and Selection of Tracts on 1 John, v. 7, 1824; *G. Travis*, Letters to Gibbon, in defence, 3d ed., 1794; *R. Porson*, Letters to Archd. Travis, 1795; Bp. *Marsh*, Letters to *Travis*, 1795; *W. Hales*, in his Faith in the Trinity, 2, 133, *sq.*; Cardinal *Wiseman*, in his Essays, vol. 1.—For the literature of the controversy, see *Darling's* Cyclop. Bibl. Subjects; Holy Scriptures, pp. 1718–23.)—On *John Pye Smith's* works in reply to Belsham and others, see the next section, note 24. *William Magee*, Abp. of Dublin (b. 1763, d. 1831), Dissertation on Atonement and Sacrifice (with Appendix on Mr. Belsham), new ed. 2, 1842.—During the present

century, the controversy has been continued between *Wardlaw* and *Yates*: *Yates*, Vindication of Unitarianism, 4th ed., 1850; Sequel to Vind., 2d ed., 1822: *Wardlaw*, Discourses on Principal Points of the Socinian Controversy, 2d ed., 1815; Unitarianism Incapable of Vindication, 1816 (Andover, 1817).—*Edward Burton*, of Oxford: Testimonies of Anti-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ, 2d ed., 1829; ibid., Testimony to Trinity and Divinity of Holy Ghost, 1831.—*William Hales*, Faith in the Holy Trinity, 2d ed., 2, 1818.—*G. S. Faber*, Apostolicity of Trinitarianism, 2 vols., 1832.—*John Oxlee*, Trinity and Incarnation (Jewish sources), 3 vols., 1817–30.—The leading English Unitarians of the present century are *James Martineau* (Essays and Reviews, Miscellanies, etc.); *J. R. Beard* (Voices of the Church, in reply to Strauss, 1845; Rationalism in Germany; Historic and Artistic Illustrations of the Trinity, 1846; Unitarianism in its Actual Condition, 1849); *J. H. Thom*, Commentaries, etc.]

[14] [Many Presbyterian churches became Unitarian (170 of the Unitarian chapels were originally orthodox). At the Salter's Hall Meeting, 57 of 110 ministers were against all creeds. The *Feathers' Tavern Association*, was for the abolition of subscription (particular objection to the damnatory clause in the Athanasian Creed); three hundred clergy, led by *Gilbert Wakefield* (d. 1801). See also Archd. *Blackburne* (b. 1705, d. 1787): The Confessional, 1766 (anon. reprinted in his works, vol. 5; in vols. 6 and 7, tracts on the same subject). Comp. Doubts on the Authenticity of the last Publication of the Confessional, 1768; Short View of the Controversy, 2d ed., 1775.—Complete and Faithful Account of the Papers publ. at Oxford on Subscription, 1772. *Paley*, Defence of the Considerations on the Propriety of requiring Subscription, in Reply to a late Answer: Works, vol. iv. 431, *sq.*]

[15] [*David Hartley*, b. 1705, d. 1757: Observations on Man, etc., 2 vols., 1749; 3 vols., 1791, ed. by *Priestley*, 1801; translated in German by *Pistorius*. Comp. (*Priestley*) Hartley's Theory, 1790; and *Jos. Berington*, Letter on Hartley, 1776. See above the works of Reid, Dugald Stewart, Cousin, and Morell.—*Abraham Tucker*, b. 1705, d. 1774. Light of Nature (by Edward Search); best ed. 7 vols., 1805, repr. in 2 vols., 1837. On *Priestley*, see note 13, above.]

[16] [*George Berkeley* (see § 285, *a*, note 16, and § 276, p. 384), Bp. of Cloyne, b. 1684, d. 1733: Essay towards a new Theory of Vision, 1709; Vindication, 1733 (see *Bailey's* Review of same, Lond., 1842. New ed. by Cowell, 1860. Comp. *Mill*, in Westminster Rev., 38, 39). Comp. also Blackwood's Magazine, Oct., 1841, June, 1842, June, 1843, May and Aug., 1847.]

[17] [See ante, p. 227. On the influence of his Sermons upon the ethical speculation of England, see *Mackintosh*, Diss. on Progress of Ethical Philos., Section VI.]

[18] [*Richard Price* (see note 13) Review of Principal Question in Morals, 1758, 3d ed., 1787. This was an attempt to revive the more Platonic theory of morals; the idea of right as simple and undefinable.]

§ 285, *b*.

[English Theology and Philosophy in the Present Century.]

[Though England did not directly participate in the speculative movement of the German schools, yet the philosophy of Locke and the ethics of Paley gradually lost their influence.[1] Here as in Scotland, the scepticism of Hume, was supplanted by the philosophy of common sense (see § 285, *c*). Utilitarianism was also carried to its extreme positions in the system of *Jeremy Bentham;*[2] and the inductive philosophy is made supreme in the works of *James* and *John Stuart Mill*,[3] the latter in harmony with *Comte*.[4] *Samuel Taylor Coleridge*,[5] was the prophet, rather than the systematic expounder of a more spiritual philosophy. No one system can be said to have ascendency in England ; but there are favorable representatives of various philosophical tendencies.[6]]

[The revival of theology began rather in the sphere of practical piety, than in that of abstract speculation. Stimulated by the zeal of the *Wesleys* and *Whitefield* (see § 278), whose evangelical Arminianism was in striking contrast with the ethical Arminianism of the established Church,—the Evangelical or Low Church party rapidly increased in influence during the first quarter of the century.[7] It was comparatively indifferent to the sacramental theory and the apostolical succession, and devoted to spiritual piety and evangelical works. But a strong reaction commenced, nearly coeval with the passage of the Reform Bill (1832). The advocates of High Church principles rallied with new vigor in the so-called *Oxford School* (Tracts for the Times)[8] represented by *Pusey*,[9] *Newman*,[10] *Fronde*, *Keble*, *Wilberforce* and others,[11] many of whom at last, went over to the Roman Catholic communion.[12] The *Hampden Controversy*,[13] the *Gorham Case*,[14] the *Denison Case*,[15] and the *Forbes Case*[16] in Scotland, are all connected with this movement. Besides the Evangelical and the Oxford Schools, there is a large class of liberal Anglican divines, represented by *Copleston*,[17] Archbishop *Whately*,[18] Dean *Milman*, Dean *Trench*, *Burton*, *Wordsworth* and others ;[19] still greater freedom is claimed, with a more liberal application of philosophy to theology, by the so called Broad Church.[20] The progress of biblical science is exemplified in the works of *Lee*, *Kitto*, *Tregelles*, *Davidson*, *Trench*, *Bloomfield*, *Wordsworth*, *Ellicott*, *Jowett*, *Alford* and others.[21]—The Baptists have for the most part ceased to sympathize with their earlier Antinomianism,[22] and are represented in a freer spirit by *Ryland*, *Fuller*, *Foster* and *Hall*.[23] The Independents have united an orthodox theology with a spirit of theologic inquiry, as is illustrated in the writings of *John Pye Smith*,

George Payne, *John Harris*, *R. Vaughan* and others.[24]—The conflict of Christianity with Infidelity has called forth a series of works[25] upon the Evidences, and on Natural Religion. In the recent (Oxford) *Essays and Reviews*,[26] the arguments for the Evidences of Christianity, and for the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, are seriously impugned. In *Mansel's* Bampton Lectures (1858), on the Limits of Religious Thought,[27] all positive thought is excluded from the sphere of the supernatural.]

[1] [See *Sedgwick's* Discourse, 5th ed., pp. 162 sq., criticising Paley's definition of Virtue, viz., "the doing good to mankind in obedience to the will of God, for the sake of everlasting happiness," and especially his statement, that "pleasures differ in nothing but in continuance and in intensity." See also *Mackintosh's* Preliminary Dissertation, and *Whewell's* History of Moral Philosophy. On *Locke* see *Cousin's* Psychology, trans. by *C. S. Henry*, 4th ed., 1856.]

[2] [*Jeremy Bentham*, b. 1841, d. 1832: Fragment on Government, 1776; Morale and Legislation, (1780) 1789; Theory of Legisl. (from French of *Dumont*, transl. by *R. Hildreth*, 2 vols., Brist., 1840); Deontology by *Bowring*, 1834 (see Edb. Rev., 61); Chrestomathia, 1817; Works, 11 vols., Edinb., 1843. In his Church of England and its Catechism, 1818, and his Not Paul but Jesus, he made an open attack on Christianity. (See Quart. Rev., 1818, and *Rose's* Critical Exam., 1819.) Comp. the articles of *Mill* on Bantham, in Westminster Rev., July, 1838, and Oct., 1852.]

[3] [*James Mill*, Analysis of the Phenomena of Human Mind, 1829 (see *Morell's* History of Phil., p. 237 sq.). *John Stuart Mill*, Diss. and Discuss., 2 vols.; Pol. Econ.; System of Logic, 2 vols., 1842 (New York, one vol.); new ed., 1858. Comp. *Whewell* in Philos. of Inductive Sciences; North Am. Rev., Oct., 1845; Christ. Examiner, May, 1846; New Englander, May, 1850; Princeton Review, Jan., 1856. The Westminster Review, since 1834, is the organ of this school. *G. H. Lewes*, in his Biog. Hist. of Philos. (repr. New York, 1857), represents the same tendency.]

[4] [*Auguste Comte*, a French philosopher, b. 1798, d. 1857: Cours de Philosophie Positive, 6 Tom., 1830–'42; Système de Politique Positive, 4, 1851–2. Positive Philos. of Comte, by *Harriet Martin au*, New York, 1854; Philos. of Sciences, ed. *Lewes*, 1853. Comp. Meth. Quart. Rev., 1852 sq.; Brit. Quart., April, 1854, and Oct., 1858; North British, May, 1854; North Am. Rev., July, 1854; Presb. Quart., Sept., 1857; Christ. Exam., July, 1857. Comte's inductive and materialistic theory is also at the basis of *Buckle's* Hist. of Civilization, vols., 1, 2, 1859–61. See § 285, note 11.]

[5] [*Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, b. 1772, d. 1834: The Friend, 1812; Statesman's Manual, 1816; Biographia Literaria, 2 vols., 1817 (Schelling); Aids to Reflection, 1825; Constitution of Church and State, 1830; Life by *Gillman*, vol. 1, 1838. New edition of his works, edited by *H. N. and Sara Coleridge*, 1844–9; Literary Remains, 4 vols., 1836–9; Prof. *Shedd's* edition, 7 vols., New York, 1854. Comp. Bibliotheca Sacra, iv.; Princeton Rev., 1848; Church Rev., 1854; Brit. Quart., Jan., 1854; Christ. Rev.,

July, 1854; Remusat in Revue d. deux Mondes, Oct., 1856; Eclectic Rev., (Lond.) 4th s., vol. 29, reprinted separately. His Friend, and Aids to Reflection were republished by Pres. *Marsh*, Burlington, 1831 sq., with a preliminary Essay. His Theory of the Reason, and of the Will, are the main points in Coleridge's system.]

[6] [*W. Whewell*, Hist. and Philos. of Inductive Sciences, 5 vols., 1837–40; new edition, 1857; Elements of Morality, 1845–8, repr. New York. Lect. on Systematic Morality, 1846; Moral Phil. in England, 1852. *Herbert Spencer* (of the inductive school); Psychology, 1855; Essays, 1857; proposed series on the philosophical sciences.—*J. D. Morell* (eclectic), History of Modern Philosophy; Philos. of Religion, 1849; Psychology, Part 1, 1853. —*Alexander Bain*, The Emotions and Will, 1859; Senses and Intellect, 1855.—*Isaac Taylor*, World of Mind, 1855.—*Henry L. Mansel*, Prolegomena Logica, 2d ed., 1859, Bost., 1860; Metaphysics, or the Philos. of Consciousness, from the Encycl. Britan., Edinb., 1860.—*John H. Macmahon*, A Treatise on Metaphysics, chiefly in reference to Revealed Religion, Lond., 1860.—*Wm. Archer Butler*, b. 1814, d. 1848; Lects. on Development of Christ. Doctrine, ed. *Woodward*, 1850; on Ancient Philos., 2 vols., repr Phil., 1858; Sermons.]

[7] [On the Wesleyan movement, see above, § 278. On the division between *Whitefield* and *Wesley*, see *Stevens'* History of Methodism, ubi supra. On the Wesleyan controversy as to Antinomianism and justification (1770), ibid. *Charles Wesley*, b. 1708, d. 1778; Sermons; Life and Times by *T. Jackson*, 2 vols., Lond., 1841. Among the Calvinistic Methodists was *Wm. Huntington*, *S. S.* (*i. e.* Sinner Saved), b. 1744, d. 1813; Works, 2 vols., 1820, 6 vols., 1856; comp. *Southey*, in Quart. Rev., xiv. The *Lady Huntingdon Connection* (England and Wales, in 1795 numbered about 100,000), grew up in this movement; see Mem. of *Selina Huntingdon*, (b. 1707, d. 1791), 2, 1840. Representatives of the Evangelical Party; *Charles Simeon*, b. 1759, d. 1836; Horæ Homileticæ, 21 vols., 1840, Memoirs by *Carus*, 1847. *Henry Venn*, b. 1725, d. 1797, Sermons, Complete Duty of Man, etc. *William Wilberforce*, the Statesman, b. 1759, d. 1833; Practical View (frequent editions); Life, 5 vols., 1839. *Hannah More*, b. 1745, d. 1833; Works, 11 vols., 1830 (repr. New York). *Richard Cecil*, b. 1748, d. 1810; Works and Mem., 4 vols., 1811. *John Newton*, of Olney, b. 1725, d. 1807; Works, 2d ed., 1816. *William Romaine*, b. 1714, d. 1795; Life of Faith; Works, 8 vols., 1796. *William Cowper*, the poet, b. 1731, d. 1800; Life and Works by *Southey*, 15 vols., 1836, '7. *John Jebb*, Bp. Limerick, b. 1775, d. 1833; Practical Theol., 2d ed., 2 vols., 1837; Sacred Lit., new ed., 1831. *Reginald Heber*, Bp. Calcutta, b. 1783, d. 1826; Hymns, Sermons, Narrative, etc.; Life, 2, 1830. *Daniel Wilson*, Bp. Calcutta, d. 1858; Evidences of Christ. 4th ed., 1841 (repr. Bost. 1830); Lect. on Colossians, Sermons, etc. *Edw. Bickersteth*, b. 1786, d. 1850; on Prayer, Baptism, Restoration of the Jews, etc. *John Cumming*, (Scotch Church, Lond.); Apocalyptic Sketches, Prophetic Studies, etc. *Jas. Hamilton* (Scotch Church, Lond.); Royal Preacher, etc.

[8] [*Tracts for the Times*, by Members of the University of Oxford, 6 vols., 1833–40, 90 in number. They declared that the Church of England was

not Protestant, and advocated (1.) Apostolical Succession; (2.) Sacramental Grace (baptismal regeneration and the eucharistic sacrifice); (3.) Independence of Church upon State; (4.) Episcopal and Church authority; tradition with the Scriptures; (5.) Revival of certain ecclesiastical usages, *e. g.*, altars of stone, lights, private confession, etc. No. 90 by *J. H. Newman*, advocated subscription to the Article in a non-natural sense; condemned by the Hebdomadal Board. Comp. *F. Oakley*, Tract No. 90 examined, 1841; *J. H. Newman*, Letter to Bp. of Oxf. on No. 90; *E. B. Pusey*, Articles in Tract 90 reconsidered, in a Letter to *R. W. Jelf*. Among the most significant of these Tracts, were Pusey on Baptism (No. 67); Apostol. Succession (74); Reserve in communicating religious knowledge (80, 87). The Library of Anglo Catholic Theology, containing reprints of works illustrating Anglican theology; and the Library of Fathers of the Holy Cath. Church (ed. by *Pusey*, *Keble* and *Marriott*), aided in this movement.]

[9] [*E. B. Pusey*, Regius Prof. of Hebr., Oxf.; Letter to Bp. of Oxf., on Tendency to Romanism, 4th ed., with Preface on Justification, 1840; To Abp. of Canterbury, on Present Crisis, 3d ed., 1842; Sermons, 1845; Parochial Serm., 1848–53; Royal Supremacy, 1850; Sermon on Holy Eucharist, 1843 (proceedings against him for this); The Church of Eng. leaves her Children Free to open their Griefs, 1850, with a Vindication: Hist. of Councils, 1858; Minor Prophets, Pt. 1, 1860.]

[10] [*John Henry Newman;* Arians of Fourth Cent., 1833; Parochial Sermons, 6 vols., 1835 sq.; Prophetical Office of Church, 2d ed., 1838; Justification, 2d ed., 1840; Chh. of Fathers, 2d ed., 1842; Sermons, 1843; Essays on Miracles, 1843; Essay on Development of Christ. Doctrine, 1845 (comp. *Milman* on this, in Quart. Rev., vol. 77; *William Archer Butler*, ubi supra; Maurice in Preface to his Lect. on Hebrews, 1846; Archd. *Hare*, in his Charge, 1852: *Palmer's* Doctrine of Development and Conscience, 1846; *W. J. Goode*, on Theory of Development, 1846). Mr. Newman submitted to the Roman Catholic Church in 1845.]

[11] [*Richd. H. Froude*, b. 1803, d. 1836. Remains, 4 vols., 1838 (he gave an impulse to this whole movement). *John Keble;* Primitive Tradition, 1839; Christian Year, and Lyra Innocentium; Psalter in English verse; Sermons, 1847; Prælect. Academ., 2, Oxf., 1844; ed. Hooker's Eccl. Polity. *Samuel Wilberforce*, Bp. of Oxf.; Charges, Sermons, etc. *Henry Wm.* and *Robert Isaac Wilberforce*, became Roman Catholics, the latter wrote: Doctrine of Baptism, 2d ed., 1849; Incarnation, 3d ed., 1850; Eucharist, 1853; Sermons on New Birth, 1850. *Wm. G. Ward*, (Rom. Cath.); Ideal of Christ. Church, 1844; Nature and Grace, 1860. *Fred. Oakeley* (R. C.); On Submitting to Cath. Church, Sermons, etc. *F. W. Faber* (R. C.); Tracts on Church and Prayer Book. *Henry Ed. Manning*, Archd. Chichester (became R. C.); Unity of Church, 1842; Sermons, 5 vols.; Holy Baptism, 1844; Grounds of Faith, 1852. *William Maskell* (Rom. Cath.); Monumenta Ritualia Eccles. Anglic., 3, 1846–7; Holy Baptism, 1848; Absolution, 1849; Royal Supremacy, 1850. *W. E. Gladstone;* The State in its Relations with the Church, 2 vols., 4th ed., 1841. *Robert Owen*, Introd. to Dogmatic Theol., Lond., 1858.]

[12] [*Ward*, *Oakley*, *Dalgairns* and *Faber*, became Rom. Cath. in 1845

with *Mr. Newman*. After the Gorham Case and the papal aggression (1851), *Manning*, *Dodsworth*, the two *Wilberforces*, *Scott*, *Allies* and *Maskell*, also seceded; the Christ. Remembrancer, 1860, says, all of these but Scott and Maskell were originally Low Church. In 1850–1, the secessions to Rome were over 100 clergymen; in 1852, 200 clergymen and as many laity; from Oxford, 118 clergymen and laymen. Comp. *B. Price*, The Anglo Catholic Theory, from Edinb. Rev., Oct., 1851, Lond., 1852; *Cardinal Wiseman*, Essays, vol. 2; ibid., on High Church Claims, 1842; Christ. Remb., Jan., 1860; Archd. *Hare*, on Contest with Rome, 1852; Church Eng. Quart., 1854; Bp. *C. P. McIlvaine*, Oxford Divinity, Phila., 1841; *Isaac Taylor*, Ancient Christianity, 2 vols., 4th ed., 1844; *Goode*, on Baptism and the Divine Rule, 2 vols., 1842; *Palmer*, on Church, 2 vols., 1841.]

[13] [*Renn Dickson Hampden* (Bp. Hereford, 1847), Phil. Evid. of Christ., 1827; Parochial Serm., 2d ed., Lond., 1836; Oxford Serm., 1848; Lects. on Moral Philos.; Tradition, 4th ed., 1841; Thos. Aquinas, etc., from Encycl. Metrop., 1832, 3d ed., 1848. His Lectures (Bampton) on the Scholastic Philos. in Relation to Christ provoked the chief controversy. Comp. British Critic, xiv.; *Henry Christmas*, Hist. of Hampden Controv., 1848 (with documents); Corresp. between D. H. and Dr. Howley, Abp. Cant., 2d ed., 1838; *Julius Chs. Hare*, Letter to Dean of Chichester, 1848; Dr. H.'s Theol. Statements and the Thirty-Nine Articles, 1836; Edb. Rev. lxii.; North British, viii.; Frazer's Mag., xxxvii.; Church Rev. (New Haven) i.]

[14] [*The Gorham Case*, 1847, *sq.* Mr. Gorham denied unconditional baptismal regeneration; was prosecuted by Bp. *Philpotts*, of Exeter, who was sustained in the Court of Arches; but this decision was reversed before the Queen in Council, 1850. Comp. *W. E. Gladstone*, on Royal Supremacy, 1850; *Julius Chs. Hare*, Letter to Cavendish, 2d ed., 1850. Letters to the Primate by a Layman; *W. J. Irons*, The Present Crisis, and Sequel; *Keble*, Church Matters in 1850; Edinb. Rev., xcii. xcv.]

[15] [*Denison Case*, 1853–8, on Presence of Body and Blood of Christ in the eucharist; Arch. Denison, removed by of Bp. of Bath; Appeal of Ditcher *vs.* Denison dismissed by Privy Council, 1858.]

[16] [*Alex. Forbes*, Bishop of Brechin, 1847 (Scotland), Explanation of Nicene Creed, etc., 1852. The controversy in his case is upon the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist, in his Charge, 1857. Documents collected, 1860. *Mr. Cheyne*, who advocated the real presence, was condemned by the Scottish bishops, 1859.]

[17] [*Edward Copleston*, Bp. Llandaff, b. 1776, d. 1849: on Necessity and Predestination, 1821 (comp. Quart. Rev. xxvi.); Prælectiones Academicæ, 1813, 1838; Sermons and Essays; Replies to Edinb. Rev. against Oxford, 1810–11; Memoirs, 1851. He was the head of the Oriel School. (Whately, Arnold, etc.)]

[18] [*Richard Whately*, Abp. Dublin, Bampton Lect. on Party Feeling, 1822; Logic; Rhetoric; Essays; (1) Some Peculiarities of Christ. Revel., 4th ed., 1837, (2) Difficulties in St. Paul, 5th ed., 1845, (3) Errors of Romanism traced to their Origin in Human Nature, 4th ed., 1830; The Kingdom of Christ delineated, 1841; Hist. of Relig. Worship, 2d ed., 1849; Good and Evil Angels, 1851; Future State, 1854, etc.]

[19] *Henry Hart Milman*, Dean of St. Paul's; Bampton Lect., 1827, on Character and Conduct of the Apostles; Hist. of Jews, 3 vols., 1840; Hist. of Christ. to Abolition of Paganism, 3, Lond., 1840 (New York, one vol.); Hist. of Latin Christ., 6 vols., 2d ed., 1859, 8 vols., New York, 1860. *Richard Chevenix Trench*, Dean of Westminster: Hulsean Lect., 1845–6 (repr. Phil.), on Fitness of Holy Scripture for unfolding Spiritual Life, and Christ the Desire of all Nations; Notes on Parables, 1841, and Miracles, 1852, various editions, reprinted New York, 1854; on Words, Proverbs, English Version, etc.—*Edward Burton*, Prof. Div. Oxf., b. 1794, d. 1836 (Works 5, 1837); Heresies of Apostolic Age, 1829; Testimonies of Ante-Nicene Fathers to Trinity etc.; Eccl. Hist. of first Three Centuries, 3d ed., 1845; Hist. of Church to Constantine, 1836.—*J. J. Blunt*, Marg. Prof. Oxf., d. 1859: Ref. in England, 5th ed., 1840; Undesigned Coincidences, 3d ed., 1850; Lects. on Early Fathers; Constitution of Early Church, etc. *Christopher Wordsworth*, b. 1774, d. 1846: Christ. Institutes, 1837; Eccles. Biog., 4 vols., 1839.—Among the other Anglican divines who have written chiefly on church history or patristic literature, are *Routh*, *Gaisford*, *Jacobson*, *Greswell*, *Hardwick*, *Faber*, *J. M. Neale*, *Stebbing*, *Cardwell*, *Hook*, *Chs. Maitland*, *S. R. Maitland*, etc.—*G. H. Browne* on Thirty-Nine Articles, 2 vols. *J. B. Mozley*, Baptismal Regen.; Augustinian Predestination, 1855.]

[20] [The so-called *Broad Church* designates, indefinitely, a class of writers, who received an impulse from the philosophy and critical method of *Coleridge* (see above, note 5), and from the liberal and earnest historical spirit of *Arnold*. It is difficult to name those that belong here, for it is rather a tendency than a school. *Bunsen* was affiliated with them. *Thos. Arnold*, Head-Master of Rugby, b. 1798, d. 1842: Hist. of Rome, 3, 1840–3; later Rom. Commonwealth, 2, 1847; Introductory Lect. on Mod. Hist., 2d ed., 1843; Fragment on the Church, 1844; on Prophecy, 1844; Sermons; Miscellaneous Works: Life, by *A. P. Stanley*. (Most of his works republ. in New York.—On his Theological Opinions, see *Tappan*, in Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan., 1858.)—*Julius Chs. Hare*, d. 1855: Victory of Faith, etc., 1840; Unity of Church; Mission of Comforter, 2d ed., 2, 1836 (Appendix on Luther); Guesses at Truth (with his Brother), 1847, rep. Boston, 1860; Contest with Rome (against Newman), 1852.—*F. D. Maurice*, Kingdom of Christ, 1838, 1842 (repr.); Epist. to Hebrews, 1846; Religions of World (Boyle Lect.), 1847; Lord's Prayer, 1848; Lectures on O. T., 1851, *sq.*; Theol. Essays, 1853; on Revelation (against Mansel), 1859, etc.—*F. W. Robertson*, d. 1858: Sermons.—*McLeod Campbell*, on the Atonement, 1856. *Chs. Kingsley:* Village Sermons; Limits of Exact Science as applied to History, etc.—*Arthur P. Stanley*, Apost. Age, 1847; Memorials of Canterb.; Lectures on Eastern Church, 1861.]

[21] [*Samuel Lee*, b. 1783, d. 1853: Hebr. Gram. and Lex.; Book of Job, etc. Journal of Sacred Lit., ed. by *Kitto*, 1848–53, now by *Burgess*. *Kitto* published Illustrated Comm. on O. and N. Test., 5, 1840, *sq.*; Cycl. Bibl. Lit.; Bible Illustrations, etc. *S. P. Tregelles:* Daniel, 1852; Historic Evidences; History of Printed Text N. Test., etc.—*Samuel Davidson:* Bibl. Criticism, 2, 1852; Hermeneutics, 1843; Introd. to N. Test., 3, 1848–

51, Controversy on his edition of the 2d vol. of Horne's Introduction, new ed. *S. T. Bloomfield:* Recensio Synoptica, 8, 1826; Greek Test., 2, 1841–50. *Chs. Wordsworth*, Apocalypse, 1848–9; ed. of N. Test. and Comm., etc.—*C. J. Ellicott*, on Epistles.—*Conybeare* and *Howson*, on St. Paul.—*Alford*, New Test., 4 vols.—*Jowett*, on Gal., Cor., etc.]

[22] [On *Gill*, see Note 13 of previous section. *Abraham Booth*, b. 1734, d. 1806: Works, 3 vols., 1813; The Reign of Grace; Death of Legal Hope the Life of Evangelical Obedience, etc.]

[23] [*John Ryland* (the father), b. 1723, d. 1792: Scheme of Infidelity, 1770; Contemplation on Creation, 3, 1779–82. *John Ryland* (the son), b. 1753, d. 1825.—*Andrew Fuller*, b. 1754, d. 1815. Works, 1853, and often: Gospel Worthy of all Acceptation; Calvinism and Socinianism compared; Letters on Controversy with Rev. *A. Booth*; Antinomianism contrasted with the Religion of the Scriptures, etc. He adopted in the main the principles of Jonathan Edwards.—*Samuel Stennett*, d. 1795: Works, 3, 1824.—*John Foster*, b. 1768, d. 1843: Essays; Popular Ignorance; Contributions to Eclectic Rev., 2, 1844. Life by *J. E. Ryland*, 2d ed., 2, 1848.—*Robert Hall*, b. 1764, d. 1831: Works, with Life by *Gregory*, 6, 1839; Reminiscences, by *John Greene*, 1832.—*Alex. Carson*, Baptism in its Modes and Subjects, 1844, etc.]

[24] [*John Pye Smith*, Principal of Homerton, b. 1775, d. 1851. The Sacrifice of Christ, 1813; Script. Test. to Messiah, 1847; Script. and Geology, 4th ed., 1848; First Lines of Christ. Theol. (posthumous), 2d ed., 1860; Memoirs by Medway.—*George Payne*, d. 1848: Mental and Moral Science, 3d ed., 1845; Divine Sovereignty, 3d ed., 1846; Original Sin, 1845; Lect., on Theol., 2 vols., 1850.—*John Harris*, Principal of New College, d. 1857: Great Teacher; Man Primeval, 1849; Præ-Adamite Earth, etc. *E. Henderson*, Divine Inspiration (Cong. Lect.), 1836; Isaiah, 1840; Minor Prophets, 1845 (repr. Andov., 1859); Jeremiah, 1851. *William Jay*, d. 1859: Works, 12 vols.—*Robert Vaughan*, ed. of Brit. Quart. Rev., Causes of Corruption of Christ., 1852; Essays, 2, 1849; John de Wycliffe, 1832, 1853; Congregationalism and Modern Society; Revolutions in Eng. Hist., 1859–61. *John Kelly:* The Divine Covenants, 1861.]

[25] [Among these are the Bridgewater Treatises; the prize (Burnet) essays of *Thompson* and *Tulloch; Pearson*, on Infidelity; *Hampden's* Phil. Evidences; *Smyth*, Lect. on Evid.; *Faber's* Difficulties of Infidelity; *E. Dove*, Logic of Christianity; *W. H. Mill*, Christian Advocate (against Strauss); *T. Young*, Christ in History; *Isaac Taylor*, Restoration of Belief; *Birks*, Difficulties of Belief; *Henry Rogers*, The Eclipse of Faith, etc.; *Ed. Miall*, Bases of Belief, 3d ed., 1861.]

[26] [Essays and Reviews, 1859, 9th ed., 1861, reprinted Boston, ed. by *F. H. Hedge*, under the title, Recent Inquiries in Theology. They are under examination by a Committee of Convocation. In these Essays, Dr. *Rowland Williams* reproduces the critical hypotheses of Bunsen; *Baden Powell* (d. 1860, author of Essays Nat. Phil., Inductive Science, etc.), discredits the argument from miracles; Mr. *Goodwin* shows the inconsistency between science and the Mosaic Cosmogony; Prof. *Jowett* advocates such an interpretation of Scripture as would annul every creed in Christendom. Numer-

ous articles and works (over 50) have already been written in reply; Westminster Rev., Oct., 1860; Quart. Review, Jan., 1861; British Quart. Jan.; North Brit. Review, Aug. (*Isaac Taylor*); Christ. Rembr., Oct, 1860; Edinb. Rev., April, '61 (*Stanley?*); Journal Sac. Lit., April; North Am. Rev., Jan; Am. Theol. Rev., April; Am. Quart. Church Rev., July. See also *Jas. Buchanan*, Essays and Reviews Examined, Edb., 1861; *Jelf*, Specific Evidence of Unsoundness, etc.; Lord *Lindsay*, Scepticism, its Retrogressive Character.

[27] [The position taken in these Lectures is, that the ideas of the Infinite, Absolute, Cause, etc., are negative in the view of reason), the result of an impotence of the mind. This is on the basis of *Hamilton's* theory of knowledge. Comp. North British, Feb., 1859; Brownson's Quart., Jan., 1860; Am. Theol. Rev., Feb., 1860; Bibliotheca Sacra (*Hickok*), Jan., 1860; Brit. Quart., July, 1860; *Dorner*, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1860; *Maurice*, What is Revelation? and Mansel's Reply, 1859–60; *John Young*, Province of Reason, 1860.]

§ 285, *c.*

THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY IN SCOTLAND.

[The discussions and divisions in Scotland during the first half of the eighteenth century, were chiefly ecclesiastical,[1] though theological differences came to light in the *Marrow Controversy*,[2] and *Sandemanianism*.[3] The *Moderates*[4] ruled under the Robertson administration (1758–82): the tone of their theology was moral, mitigating the strictness of the old Confessions. (*Leechman*, *Blair*, *Beattie*, *Macknight*, *Campbell*).[5] The theological writings of the *Erskines*, *Maclaurin*, *John Dick* and Principal *Hill*, upheld the Scotch orthodoxy.[6]]

[Philosophical investigations were most rife in Scotland, when England was indifferent to speculation. The scepticism of *David Hume*[7] was supplanted by the vigorous common sense of *Thomas Reid*.[8] On the same general basis *Dugald Stewart*,[9] wrote his eloquent Disquisitions. Dr. *Thos. Brown*,[10] in his fervid Lectures criticised details of the system with great ingenuity, without effecting permanent results. *Sir William Hamilton*, with unusual learning and subtility, commented on Reid, defined clearly the province of Logic, and tried to overthrow transcendental speculations by a denial of all positive knowledge of the Infinite and the Absolute.[12] Other Scotch philosophers[12] have rendered good service in different branches of speculation.]

[The revival of evangelical theology was stimulated by the preaching and teaching of *Thos. Chalmers*.[13] The Free Church, 1843, (the most remarkable religious movement of the century) doubled

the efficiency of the church. The recent representatives of Scotch theology (*John Brown, Dick, Crombie, Dewar, Symington, McCrie, Buchanan, Candlish, Cunningham* and others),[15] and of Biblical learning (*Eadie, Fairbairn*, etc.)[16] unite adherence to the older confessions with a liberal and earnest scholarship. The Independents[1] are represented by *Wardlaw* and *W. L. Alexander*. The Unitarian controversy divided for a time the Irish Presbyterians.[18]]

[1] [*The Associate Presbytery* (Ralph and Eben Erskine, with six others) was formed in 1733 (Synod 1746) because the Assembly yielded on the question of civil patronage. This was again divided, 1747, into *Burghers* and *Anti-Burghers*, on the question of the oath administered to freemen in the Royal Burghs. (The Burghers, 1786, divided into *New* and *Old Light*). The *Reformed Presbyterians* (*Covenanters, Cameronians*), separated in 1743 (opposed to the Revolution settlement); the *Relief Secession* (*Thos. Gillespie, Thos. Boston*), 1761, in opposition to patronage.]

[2] [The Assembly in 1710, passed an act for the Preservation of the Purity of Doctrine, bearing against the stricter adherents to the Covenants. Prof. *Simpson* of Glasgow, was mildly censured for Arminian views, while the Auchterarder Creed (interpreted as Antinomian) was condemned. In 1718 *Fisher's Marrow of Modern Divinity* (published in 1646: *Edward Fisher*, b. 1597, d. in Ireland), was republished by *Hog;* and the *Neonomians* (moderates) of the Assembly, 1720, condemned five propositions said to be drawn from it; 1. That assurance is of the essence of faith. 2. Unlimited offer of Christ to all men, a warrant to each one to receive Christ. 3. Holiness not necessary to salvation. 4. Punishment and reward not motives to obedience. 5. The law is not a rule of life to believers. The book was prohibited—and ran through numerous editions; 19th ed., by *Boston*, 1803. The Associate Secession (above) was involved in this controversy.]

[3] [*John Glas*, b. 1638, d. 1773; Works, 2d ed., 5, 1782; in 1727, he published a treatise to show that civil establishments are unchristian (The Testimony of the King of Martyrs concerning his Kingdom): he was deposed and formed a sect. In 1775 *Robert Sandeman*, an elder in one of these churches (b. 1723, d. in America 1771), wrote Letters on [Hervey's] Theron and Aspasia, maintaining that faith is the simple assent of the understanding to the truth (opposing Flavel, Boston and the Erskines); and that the death of Christ, without man's act, is sufficient to justify. Sandeman came to America in 1764. These churches maintained unanimity by expelling the minority. See *Andrew Fuller's* Twelve Letters (Works, 256–294); *Bellamy's* Nature and Glory of the Gospel.]

[4] [*William Robertson*, the historian (b. 1721, d. 1793, minister at Edinburgh, 1759, Principal of Univ., 1762), was for a long time the recognized leader of the Assembly, and head of the moderate party. He only published one Sermon, viz., The Situation of the World at the Time of Christ's Appearance, 6th ed., 1791. *Geo. Cook* (minister of Laurence Kirk, author of Hist. of Ref. in Scotland, 2d ed., 3, 1819, and Hist. of Chh. of S., 3, 1815) suc-

cce led Robertson as leader, giving a higher tone; and Principal *Hill* followed. As late as 1796, the Assembly rejected a proposal for foreign missions. *Buckle*, in his Hist. of Civilization (vol. 2, 1861), gives a caricature rather than a history of the state of religion in Scotland.]

[5] [Many of the moderates adopted the ethical principles of *Francis Hutcheson*, b. 1694, Prof. at Glasgow, 1729, d. 1747; Introd. to Moral Philos., 1747; Moral Sense, 3d ed., 1769; Origin of Ideas of Beauty and Virtue, 1725; 5th ed., 1753; System of Moral Phil., with his character by *Leechman*, ed. by his son, 2, 4to., 1775; Letters on Virtue, 1772. *Wm. Leechman*, Prof. at Glasgow, 1743, d. 1783; Sermons with Memoir by *Jas. Wodrow*, 2, 1789. *Hugh Blair*, b. 1718, d. 1800: Sermons, Lectures on Rhetoric 3, 1803; he defended Hume against the Assembly.—*James Beattie*, b. 1735, Prof. in Aberdeen, d. 1803: On Immutability of Truth, 1770 (for which the Univ. of Oxford made him LL. D.); Essays; Moral and Critical Dissertations, 1783; Evidences, 4th ed., 1795; Moral Sciences, 3d ed., 1817; Life by Sir *Wm. Forbes*, 3, 1807.—*James Macknight*, b. 1721, d. 1800: Harmony of Gospels, 5th ed., 2, 1819; Epistles, 4, 1795, and often since. *Geo. Campbell*, b. 1719, Principal of Marischall College, 1759, Prof. Div., 1771, d. 1796. The Four Gospels, 1790, 4, 3d ed., 1814; Diss. on Miracles, 1762, new ed., 1823, transl. in French, Dutch and German; Rhetoric, 1776; Lect. on Syst. Theol., 1807; Eccles. Hist., 1800, and often (Bp. *Skinner's* Positive Truth and Order, 1803, in reply). *Thos. Reid* (see below). *Carlyle* (Autobiography, first publ., 1860, also belonged to the Moderates.]

[6] [Evangelical Religion had a strong hold of the popular mind. *Whitefield* was in Scotland nine times, 1741–68. There was constant correspondence between the Scotch and American Divines. *Ebenezer Erskine*, b. 1680, d. 1754 (a grandson of Ralph Erskine, who had 33 children); Works, 3, 1799, 1810; Sermons and Discourses; Life, 1831. His brother *Ralph*, 1685–1752: Works, 2, fol., 1764–66; 10, 1777–1821. *John Erskine*, 1721–1803: Theol. Diss., 1765; Sketches of Church Hist. and Theol. Controv., 2, 1790–7. *Thos. Gillespie* (of Presb. of Relief), d. 1774.—*John Maclaurin* of Glasgow, b. 1793, d. 1854: Prophecies relating to Messiah; Nature of Happiness; Sermons and Essays; Works, 2, 1860, ed. *W. H. Goold* ("scarcely less intellectual than Butler, he is as spiritual as Leighton" —*Dr. John Brown*). His sermon on Glorying in the Cross, is of high repute.—*John Dick* (Prof. to Associate Synod), b. 1764, d. 1833; Lectures on Theol., 2d ed., 1838, repr. New York, 1856; Inspiration, 3d ed., 1813; on Acts, 3d ed., 1848.—*George Hill*, b. 1748, Principal St. Mary's, d. 1820; Theol. Institutes, 1803; Lect. on Divinity, 3, 1821; 5th ed., 1849, New York, 1847. *Jas. Morison* was condemned, 1841, for holding that Christ died equally for all men (in United Secession Synod, *Dr. Brown* dissenting); he afterwards also denied unconditional election; an Evangelical Union formed.]

[7] [*David Hume*, (see § 275, 285.) His essay on Miracles provoked the most immediate opposition; but the fundamental principles of his sceptical philosophy, asserting that nothing is certain (real) but sensations and ideas, aroused a profounder criticism; awaking Kant in Germany "from his dogmatic slumbers," and leading Reid to plant philosophy upon "common sense,"

afterwards defined as the "fundamental laws of human belief." See *Cousin*, Hist. of Mod. Philos.; *Hamilton's* Discussions; Christ. Exam. (*Walker*), Nov., 1854; *Brownson's* Quarterly, Oct., 1855; Christ. Rev., April, 1855; Quart. Rev., 73.]

[8] [*Thos. Reid*, Prof. Moral Philosophy, in Glasgow, d. 1796: Inquiry into the Human Mind on Principles of Common Sense, 1764; Essay on the Intellectual Powers of the Human Mind, 1764; 3, 1819; Active Powers, 1788; *Hamilton's* ed., Edinb., 1846–52, 5th ed., 1858, incomplete (made doubly valuable by Hamilton's notes). *Stewart's* Life and Writings of Reid, (Works, vii., 207–293). His works have been translated into French; Reyer-Collard adopted his views: see *Cousin's* Lectures. Metaphysics, as distinct from Psychology, was ignored in Scotland from the time of Reid.]

[9] [*Dugald Stewart*, b. 1753, d. 1828: Elements of Philos. of Human Mind; Moral Philos. (Walker's ed., Bost., 1850); Phil. Essays; Progress of Philos. (in Encycl. Brit.); Works, 7 vols., Bost., 1829, new ed., by Hamilton, 1858 *sq.* Life and Philos., in North British, 1858. See also *Mackintosh* in Edinb. Rev. xxvii., and *Jeffrey*, ibid., xvii.; Quart. Rev. vi.; *Morell's* Hist. Phil. His Elem. of Phil., transl. into French, by *Prévost* of Geneva; 2d. vol., by *Farcy;* his Prelim. Disc. by *Buchon;* Phil. of Active Powers, by *Simon.*]

[10] [*Thos. Brown, M. D.*, b. 1778, d. 1820. Inquiry into Relation of Cause and Effect (invariable antecedent), 1804, 4th ed., 1835; Lectures on Phil. Human Mind, ed. *D. Welsh*, 1820, 11th ed., 1838; abridged U. S. ed., *Hedge*, 2; Lect. on Moral Philos., ed. *Chalmers.* Comp. North Am. xix., and for July, 1829; North British, 1857. *Sir Wm. Hamilton's* severe article against Brown (on Perception) in Edbg. Rev., 1830, is reprinted in his Discussions. Brown's system makes mental philosophy to be essentially a generalization of states of mind; the faculties are put under the two great laws of simple and relative suggestion.]

[11] [*Sir William Hamilton*, b. in Glasgow, 1788, Prof. Logic and Metaph. in Edinb., 1836, d. 1856. Review of Cousin, Edinb. Rev., 1829; on Whately's Logic, 1833; Discussions in Phil. Lit., etc., New York, 1853; Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic, ed. by *Mansel* and *Veitch* (4 vol), Bost., 2, 1859–60; Essays in French, by *Peisse.* While verbally defending, he in reality undermined, the fundamental principles of the Scotch system, making infinite and absolute merely negative to thought, though admitting the necessity of belief. Comp. *Baynes*, in Edinb. Essays, 1854. On his system see *Calderwood's* Philos. of Infinite, 2d ed., 1861; Philos of Sir W. H., arranged by *O. W. Wight*, New York, 1853; North British, Nov., 1858, May, 1859; Brit. Quart., Nov., 1852; Prosp. Rev., July, 1853; Westminster, April, 1859; Frazer's Mag., 1860; Christ. Rev., Jan., 1854, Jan., 1860, July, 1861; Brownson's Quart., 1855; Meth. Quart., Jan., 1857, July, 1861; South Presb., Jan., 1856; Presb. Quart., Oct., 1858; Princeton Rev., Oct., 1859, and July, 1860; New Englander, Feb., 1860; Bib. Sacra, Jan, 1861; North Am., Jan., 1861; *Rémusat* in Rev. des deux Mondes; American Theol. Rev., Jan., 1861, and *McCosh*, in his work on Intuitions, 1860.]

[12] [*J. F. Ferrier*, Institutes of Metaphysics, the Theory of Knowing and Being, 2d ed., 1856.—*Jas. McCosh*, Method of Divine Government, Physical and Moral, repr., New York, 1851; Typical Forms, 1856; Intuitions of

the Mind inductively investigated, 1860. *P. G. Dove*, Theory of Human Progression, 1851; Logic of Christianity, 1856.—*Jas. Douglas*, Philos. of Mind, 1839. *Geo. Jamieson*, Essentials of Philos., Edbg., 1859. *A. C Fraser*, Rational Philosophy, 1858. *J. G. Maccicar*, Inq. into Human Nature. *Chalmers* and *Wardlaw*, see below.]

[13] [*Thos. Chalmers*, b. 1780, Glasgow, 1814; Prof. St. Andrew's 1824; Edinb., 1828; Prof. Theol. Free Church College, 1843; d. 1847; Works, 25 vols.: Posthumous, ed. *Hanna*, 9 vols.; Memoirs, 4 vols.—Among his works are Natural Theology; Internal Evidences; Sketches of Moral and Mental Phil.; Discourses on Astronomy, 1817; Christian and Economic Polity, 1821–6; Political Economy, 1832; Lectures on Romans; Bridgewater Treatise; Horæ Biblicæ; Institutes of Theology, 2; Prælections on Butler, Paley and Hill. He adopted, in the main, the theology of Edwards, according with him (in his Lects. on Romans) in respect to the imputation of Adam's sin, though afterwards modifying his statements on this point.]

[14] [The Free Church movement was on the question of State patronage and intrusion, raised by the Auchterarder case, 1837. The Assembly, 241 to 110, in 1842, passed the *Protest an'nt Encroachments*. The House of Lords decided against it. In 1843, Solemn Protest against State Encroachments, and withdrawal of 474. Dr. *Welch*, moderator; Chalmers, Gordon, McFarlane and others. Five hundred new churches were built in a year. Comp. *Candlish*, Summary of the Quest. respecting the Church of Scotland, 1841.]

[15] [*John Brown* (United Presb.), d. 1857: Civil Obedience, 3d ed., 1839, First Epistle of Peter, 2d ed., 1849 (New York); Discourses and Sayings of Christ, 3, 1852 (N. Y.); Our Lord's Intercessory Prayer, 1850; Resurrection of Life, 1852, etc.; Sufferings and Glories of Messiah; Galatians, 1853.—*Thos. Dick*, b. 1774, d. 1857; Christian Philosopher, 1823, and often; Philos. of Religion; Philos. of Future State. Works, 10 vols., Phil.—*Alex. Crombie*, b. 1760, d. 1842: Philos. Necessity, 1793; Natural Theol., 2, 1829, etc.—*Daniel Dewar*, Design of Christ., 1818; Holy Spirit, 1847; The Church, 1845; Elements of Moral Phil., 2, 1826; Nature of Atonement, new ed., 1860.—*Thos. McCrie*, b. 1772, d. 1835: Life of Melville; Ref. in Spain (1829), Italy (1833); Sketches Eccles. Hist.; Life by his Son, 1840.—*Jas. Buchanan*, Office of Holy Spirit, 4th ed., 1843; on Modern Infidelity and Atheism, 2, 1858. *William Symington*, Atonement and Intercession of Christ, 1834, New York, 1856, on Justification; Elements of Divine Truth.—*Geo. Stevenson*, The Offices of Christ.—*Gordon* (*Rob.*) Christ in Old Test., 2 vols.—*Hugh Miller*, d. 1856, Footprints of Creation; Old Red Sandstone, 4th ed., 1850.—*Robert S. Candlish*, Expos. of Genesis, 2, 1852; Cross of Christ; the Atonement, 1835, new ed., 1861 (the act of atonement postponed to the end of the world—so as to reconcile the universal offer with the limited redemption); Reply to Maurice, 1856; The Two Great Commandments, 1860. Principal *Cunningham*, articles in the Brit. and For. Evangelical Review, of which he is editor. The North British Review, 1844, *sq.*, is in the interest of the Free Church.]

[16] [*John Eadie* (United Presb.), Bibl. Cyclop., 6th ed., 1857; Ephesians, 1853, 1859; Colossians, 1856; Philippians, 1859.—*Patrick Fairbairn*, St.

Peter, 2, 1836; Typology of Script., 2, 1845, 3d ed., 1857, Phila. 1853; Prophecy, 1856; Hermeneutical Manual, 1858; Ezekiel.—*Donald Macdonald*, Creation and Fall, 1856; Introd. to Pentateuch, 1860.—*J. A. Haldane*, d. 1851, on Romans. *Thos. Guthrie*, The Gospel in Ezekiel.—The works of *Brown*, *Chalmers*, and *Candlish*, see above. Some of the best works of German theology have been reproduced in the valuable Foreign Library of the Clarks, Edinburgh.]

[17] [*Ralph Wardlaw*, d. 1853, Socinian Controversy, 1815–16; Ecclesiastes, 2, 1821; Christian Ethics, 3d ed., 1837 (repr. in Boston); Congregational Independency, 1848; Atonement, 3d ed., 1845; Infant Baptism, 1846; Miracles, 1852 (N. Y., 1857); posthumous, Lects. on Theol. 3, and Expository Lectures on Proverbs, etc.—*W. L. Alexander*, Connexion and Harmony of Old and New Test., 1841; Anglo-Catholicism not Apostolical, 1843; Swiss Churches, 1846; Christ and Christianity; Life and Corresp. of Wardlaw.]

[18] [In 1827 a division on the Trinity in the Ulster Synod; *W. Bruce* led the Unitarians; Dr. *Geo. Cooke*, the Trinitarians. Theological College of Belfast: *W. Gibson*, *McCosh*, *W. D. Killen* (the Ancient Church, 2d ed., 1861.)]

§ 285, *d.*

THEOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

New England: Edwards and his School.

[Christian Theology in America has received some peculiar modifications adapting it to the new position and relations of the church. Its most marked and original growth has been in the line of the Reformed or Calvinistic system. The separation of the church from the state, the unexampled immigration, and the rapid growth of the country, made the pressure to come upon the practical rather than the theoretical aspects of Christian truth. Hence, the most thorough discussions and controversies have been chiefly upon questions of anthropology and soteriology. Systems of theology have all been preached. Controversy too, has been sharpened by the fact, that in the new world are representatives of all the ecclesiastical divisions of the old world, with many sectarian subdivisions. The minor sects of Europe have had the sway in America.]

[The starting-point in this new development of the Reformed faith is with *Jonathan Edwards*,[1] who fortified the Calvinistic theology against Arminian objections, in his works, on the Will and on Original Sin. The central idea of his system is that of spiritual life (holy love) as the gift of divine grace. Extensive revivals of religion attended his preaching (*Whitefield*).[2] *Bellamy*,[3] *Smalley*,[4] *Backus*,[5] and *Stephen West*,[6] taught in the main in his spirit. Other New England divines (*Prince*, *Mayhew*, Prests. *Clap* and *Stiles*, *Samuel*

West, Chs. Chauncy, S. Mather),[7] and their Presbyterian cotemporaries (*Tennent, Davies*, Prests. *Dickinson, Burr* and *Witherspoon*), were but partially inclined to, in some cases opposing, the views of Edwards.][8]

[*Samuel Hopkins*[9] gave to Edwards's theory of virtue (love to being), the form of disinterested benevolence; held that sin (overruled) was an advantage to the universe; and equally enforced the divine sovereignty and the obligation of immediate repentance (*Hopkinsianism*). The younger *Edwards*[10] modified the theory of the atonement. *Nathaniel Emmons*[11] pressed the doctrine of divine efficiency, and the necessity of unconditional submission, to their sharpest statement, and matured the *Exercise Scheme*, denying all original sin, and making justification to consist in pardon. Other Hopkinsians, *Asa Burton*,[12] *Leonard Woods*,[13] advocated the *Taste Scheme*. The Connecticut theologians (*Smalley, Dwight, Strong*), and other New England divines, preferred a less extreme statement of the main points of the Calvinistic system.][14]

[*The New Haven theology*[15] (*Nathl. W. Taylor, Fitch, Goodrich*) planted itself in direct opposition to the old Hopkinsian theories on three points, viz., divine efficiency, sin as the necessary means of the greatest good, and the nature of virtue, while agreeing with Emmons in the position, that all that is moral is in exercises (interpreted as acts of the will). *Unitarianism*[16] was an offshoot from the lingering Arminianism of New England, and also in part a reaction from extreme Calvinistic principles, and a further, onesided, development of some of the ethical principles of the prevalent theology (*William Ellery Channing, Buckminster, Norton, Dewey* and others.)[17] The speculations of *Horace Bushnell*[18] revived the controversy as to the person of Christ.]

[1] [*Jonathan Edwards*, b. 1703, at Northampton, 1727, dismissed, 1750; missionary at Stockbridge, d. 1758, Prest. of N. J. College. He opposed the views of his predecessor and grandfather, *John Stoddard*, on the Lord's Supper as a converting ordinance. Sermons on Justif., 1738; Religious Affections, 1746; Freedom of the Will, 1754—philosophical necessity; Original Sin, 1758—identity with Adam in his transgression ("the guilt a man has upon his soul at his first existence is one and simple, viz., the guilt of the original apostacy, the guilt of the sin by which the species first rebelled against God.") His chief posthumous works (by *Hopkins*), were Hist. of Redemption, 1774; Nature of Virtue, 1788; the End of God in Creation (his declarative glory). Works: Worcester, Mass., 8, 1809; Lond. ed., *Williams*, 8, 1817; vols. 9, 10, Edinb., 1847; Lond., 2, by *Hickman*, 1839; 10 vols., with Life by *S. Dwight*, 1830; 4, N. Y., 1844; Worcester ed., rep. in N. Y. 4, 1855. On Charity and its Fruits, N. Y., 1852. Life by *Hopkins*, by *Saml. Miller* (in Sparks' Am. Biog., 1st. s. viii. Article by *Geo. Bancroft*, in New Am. Cyclop.—"I consider Jonathan Edwards

the greatest of the sons of men :" *Robert Hall.* "He in fact commenced a new and higher school in divinity, to which many subsequent writers, Erskine, Fuller, Newton, Scott, Ryland, the Milner's [Chalmers, John Pye Smith, Wardlaw], Dwight and indeed the great body of evangelical authors, who have since lived, have been indebted :" *E. Bickersteth.* "His power of subtile argument, perhaps unmatched, certainly unsurpassed among men, was joined, as in some of the ancient mystics, with a character which raised his piety to fervor :" *Sir James Mackintosh.*—On his work on the Will, see *Dugald Stewart; Isaac Taylor*, Introductory Essay, repr. Bost., 1831; Prest. *Day*, Examination of Edwards, 1841; *H. P. Tappan*, Rev. of Edwards, 3 vols., repr. in London in one vol.; *Bledsoe's* Exam. of Edwards, 1843; *Martin*, in New Englander, v.; Bibl. Repos., 1839, 1841.—*Samuel West*, of New Bedford (b. 1730, d. 1807), wrote Essays on Liberty and Necessity, 1793–5, against Edwards, to which the younger Edwards replied. *Stephen West*, of Stockbridge, vindicated Edwards in his Essay on Moral Agency, 1772. On Edwards on the Nature of Virtue, see *Bellamy*, Works, i. p. xxix.; the criticism of *Mackintosh* in Diss. on Ethical Philos., section 5; *Robert Hall*, in Works, i. 43, a note to his Sermon on Modern Infidelity; Princeton Review, 1853 (where it is incorrectly represented as Utilitarian); *E. A. Park*, in Bib. Sacra, 1853; *Ed. Beecher*, in Bib. Sac., 1853. On his work on Original Sin, see Christ. Mo. Spect. (*Taylor*) vi. x., and *Beecher's* Conflict of Ages.]

[2] [On Whitefield, see above, § 275; and *Tracy's* Great Awakening.]

[3] [*Joseph Bellamy*, b. 1719, d. 1790, at Bethlem, Ct.: True Religion delineated, against Antinomians, 1750; Wisdom of God in Permission of Sin (as means of greatest good): Div. of Christ; Letters between Theron and Aspasio, 1759; Half-Way Covenant, 1769. Works, 3, 1811; 2 by Cong. Bd., 1850. Comp. *J. Woodbridge*, in Lit. and Theol. Rev. ii. His True Religion, Letters, etc., rep. in London.]

[4] [*John Smalley*, Berlin, Ct., 1784–1820, Natural and Moral Inability, 1760 (one of the best treatises on the subject); against Universalism (*Murray*), 1785; Sermons, 2 vols. Memoir by *T. H. Skinner*, Christ. Mo. Spect. vii.]

[5] [*Charles Backus*, Norwich, Ct., 1749–1803. He educated nearly 50 theol. students, and refused the divinity chairs in Dartmouth and Yale; various Sermons; Truth of the Bible, 1797, on Regeneration.]

[6] [*Stephen West*, Stockbridge, Mass., 1736–1819: Moral Agency, 1772; Atonement, 1785; Life of *Hopkins*, 1805; Sermons. Volition, he says, is a direct effect of the divine agency; sin the necessary means of the greatest good; in these propositions he went beyond the elder Edwards.]

[7] [*Thomas Prince*, pastor of Old South Church, Boston, b. 1687, d. 1758: Chronol. Hist. of N. E., 1736–55; Sermons, ed. by *John Erskine*, Edbg. See *Wisner's* Hist. of Old South; North Am. Rev., Oct., 1860; *J. M. Manning*, in Congregational Quart., 1860.—*Jonathan Mayhew*, Boston, b. 1720, d. 1766: on Justification; Controversy with Apthorp about the Propag. Soc.; Various Sermons: see *Allen's* Biog. Dict., and *Sprague's* Annals.—*Thos. Clap*, Prest. of Yale College, b. 1703, d. 1767: Hist. and Vind of Doctrines in N. E., with a Specimen of a New Scheme, 1755 (the

new scheme was in the works of Hutcheson, Foster, Taylor, Campbell, etc.); Nature and Foundation of Moral Obligation, 1765, etc.—*Ezra Stiles*, Prest. Yale, b. 1727, d. 1795, an opponent of the new divinity. Sermons; Life by Holmes. See *Fisher's* Hist. Disc.; Am. Qu. Reg. viii.; *Spark's* Am. Biog. xvi.—*Samuel West*, New Bedford, see note 1.—*Chs. Chauncy*, of Boston, b. 1705, d. 1788: In his Seasonable Thoughts, 1743, he opposed Whitefield; 1767–1772, Controversy on Episcopacy with Chandler; Salvation of All Men, 1784 (answered by the younger Edwards); Fall and its Consequences, 1785.—*Samuel Mather*, d. 1785: Vita Franckii, 1733; Liberties of the Churches, 1738; against Chauncy's Universalism, 1781.]

[8] [*Gilbert Tennent*, b. 1703, d. 1764, the revival preacher, was in unison with Whitefield and Edwards; numerous Sermons; Trinity, 1744; Justification, 1745. See *Alexander's* Hist. of Log College, 1845; *Tracy's* Great Awakening; *Sprague's* Annals.—*Jonathan Dickinson*, Prest. N. J. Coll., b. 1688, d. 1747; Five Disc. on Election, Original Sin, etc., 1741 (against *Whitby*); Regeneration, 1743 (against *Waterland*); the two last reprinted Edinb., 1793; Controversies with John Beach on Civil Establishment of Religion, and on Free Grace (1736–46). See *Sprague* and *Allen*.—*Samuel Davies*, Prest. N. J. Coll., b. 1724, d. 1761. A great preacher; Sermons 3, 1765; 5, 1774; Lond. 5, 1767–71; New York 3, 1849–51, with an Essay by *Barnes* on his Life and Times.—*Aaron Burr*, Prest. N. J. Coll., b. 1716, d. 1757: Supreme Deity of Christ (against *Emlyn*), repr. 1791; Sermons. See *Green's* Disc. 300–313; *Allen* and *Sprague*.—*John Witherspoon*, b. 1722, in Scotland, d. 1794, Prest. N. J. Coll.: Works, ed. *Rodgers*, 4, 1802; 9 vols., Edbg., 1815; Moral Philos.; Regeneration; Justif.; Lectures on Divinity. See *Allen* and *Sprague*; and *Edwards'* Qu. Reg., 1836.]

[9] [*Samuel Hopkins*, b. 1721, Great Barrington, 1740–60, d. 1803: System of Theology, 2, 1793, 1811; Works, 3, Bost., 1853; Memoir by *E. A. Park*, 2d ed., 1854; Sin through the Divine Interposition an Advantage to the Universe, 1759; Promises of Gospel not made to the exercises of the Unregenerate (against *Mayhew*), 1765; Div. of Christ, 1768; True State of Unregenerate (against *Mills*), 1769; True Holiness (against *Hemmenway*), 1773–91; Slavery; the Millennium, etc. See *Ely*, Calvinism and Hopkinsianism, 1811; Christ. Examiner, xxxiii.; Bibl. Sacra, x., by *E. Beecher*, and Conflict of Ages, by the same.—*Hopkins* was opposed in respect to "Unregenerated Doings," by *Moses Hemmenway* (pastor in Wells, Me., for 51 years, 1759–1811), in two works, 1772–4; and by *David Tappan*, Prof. in Harvard (b. 1753, d. 1803), in a Discourse on the Character of the Unregenerate, 1782.—The points in which the old Hopkinsianism was distinguished from the older Calvinism were, 1. Divine efficiency extending to all acts (more sharply stated by Emmons); 2. Sin, the necessary means of the greatest good; 3. The atonement unlimited, as a provision; 4. Obligation to immediate repentance; 5. Sharper distinction between natural and moral ability and inability; 6. Disinterested benevolence (involving unconditional submission, in the form of a willingness to be cast away forever, for the divine glory); 7. The theory of the covenants resolved into a divine constitution (imputation, as a transfer of moral character, discredited); 8. Prior to moral exercises, there is only a divine constitution, and no moral

character (hinted at by Hopkins, and developed by Emmons). But in the exercises, the will was not yet distinguished from the affections.]

[10] [*Jonathan Edwards*, the younger, b. 1745, d. 1801, Prest. Union College, N. Y.: Salvation of All Men examined (reply to *Chauncy*); Liberty and Necessity; Three Sermons on the Atonement, 1785, etc. Works, with Memoir by *Tryon Edwards*, 2, Andov., 1842. He represents the atonement as a satisfaction to the general or public, not to the distributive, justice of God. See The Atonement; Discourses and Treatises by Edwards, Smalley, Maxcy, Emmons, Griffin, Burge, and Weeks. With an Introd. Essay by *E. A. Park*, Boston, 1859, who attempts to find hints of the same view in the earlier New Eng. divines.]

[11] [*Nathaniel Emmons*, of Franklin, Mass., b. 1745, d. 1840. Works, with Life, by *Ide*, 6 vols., 1842; enlarged, with Memoir by *E. A. Park*, 6 vols., 1858-60. See Bib. Sacra, vii., Theology of Emmons, by *Smalley*; Am. Qu. Reg. xv.; New Englander (*Fitch*); Am. Bibl. Repos. 2d s. viii. x.; Christ. Rev. vii. viii.; Princeton Rev. xiv.; Christ. Examiner, xxxiii.; New Englander (*Fisher*), 1861; Am. Theol. Review, 1861.—Among the peculiarities of his divine efficiency and exercise scheme were the following: God is the universal cause—the efficient cause of sinful as well as holy acts, yet he creates them free; sin is not merely permitted but produced by divine agency, yet man has natural power to thwart the divine decrees; each man is consituted a sinner in consequence of Adam's first sin; all sin consists in sinning—there is no original sin; true holiness demands unconditional submission, a willingness even to be cast away; every moral act is either perfectly holy or perfectly sinful; justification is simply pardon; Christians are rewarded in heaven for their own holiness. In respect to the nature of the soul, he was understood as affirming that it is a series of exercises. In his system there is a singular commingling of the idealism of Berkeley, supralapsiarian Calvinism, and natural ability. The scheme of absolute predestination has nowhere been more consistently developed, nor the responsibility of the sinner, and the claims of disinterested benevolence more earnestly enforced. His system contained sharply defined, yet contradictory elements, which must lead to a division.—*Samuel Spring*, Newburyport, Mass., d. 1819: on Immediate Coming of Christ; United Agency of God and Man (in the sense of Emmons). On the question of Divine Efficiency, see Christ. Spect., March, 1836; *E. D. Griffin*, The Div. Efficiency, 1833,—the Causal Power in Regeneration Direct; the latter reviewed in Evang. Mag., Dec., 1835.]

[12] [*Asa Burton*, of Thetford, Vt., b. 1762, d. 1836; Essays on some of the First Principles of Metaphysicks, Ethicks and Theology, Portland, 1824. Dr. B. advocated the Taste Scheme—that the essence of virtue or vice is not in exercises, but in the antecedent taste or disposition. He, probably, among the N. E. divines, first made a sharp distinction between the affections and the will. Judge *Nathaniel Niles*, of West Fairlee, Vt, (a student of Bellamy, d. 1828), advocated the same system; he published in 1809 an acute Letter on the Power of Sinners to make New Hearts, 1809; The leading Connecticut divines were opposed to the Emmons scheme (*Bellamy*, *Smalley*, *Dwight*, etc., also Dr. *Woods*; see next note). A similar position has been

held, inclining in some cases more decidedly to the literal acceptance of the Westminster Confession, by *Nathan Lord* (Prest. Dartmouth, on Justification, Faith, etc.); *John Woodbridge* (Hadley); *Heman Humphrey*, Prest. Amherst Coll., d. 1859; *Parsons Cooke* (Lynn, Mass.); *Nch. Adams* (Boston, Evenings with Doctrines, 1860.)]

[13] [*Leonard Woods*, b. 1774, d. 1846, Prof. in Andover from 1808. Works, 5 vols., Bost., 1849. Lectures on Theol., 3 vols.; Letters to Unitarians, 1820: Reply to Dr. Ware, 1821; Letters to N. W. Taylor, 1839 (on divine prevention of sin, and sin the necessary means of the greatest good); Essay on Native Depravity, 1835 (comp. Evang. Mag., Nov. 1835); on the Doctrine of Perfection (against *Mahan*). Comp. Bib. Sacra, viii. (*Humphrey*).—In the latter part of his life, Dr. Woods insisted more upon the points of agreement between the Hopkinsian theology and the generally received Calvinism. See his Theology of the Puritans.]

[14] [*Timothy Dwight*, Prest. of Yale, b. 1752, d. 1817: Theology explained and defended in a Series of Sermons, 5 vols., 1818; frequent editions in this country and in England. He inculcated the utilitarian theory of ethics; wrote against the position, that the soul is a series of exercises (Emmons? or Jonathan Edwards the younger?); and gave a temperate and judicious exposition of the New England theology.—*Nathan Strong*, Hartford, Ct., b. 1748, d. 1816; ed. Conn. Theol. Mag.; on Eternal Misery, in reply to Huntington; Sermons, 2 vols. See *Sprague's* Annals.—*Jos. Lothrop*, West Springfield, Mass., 1731–1820; Sermons, 7 vols.—*Jesse Appleton*, Prest. Bowd. Coll., d. 1818: Theol. and Acad. Lect., 2, 1837.—*Jas. Catlin*, d. 1836: Comp. of Theology, 1828.—*Enoch Pond*, Bangor; Baptism; The Church; essays and reviews.]

[15] *Nathaniel W. Taylor*, Prof. Theol. New Haven, b. 1786, d. 1858: Sermons, Lects. on Moral Government; Essays in Revealed Theology, 1858–9.—Dr. Taylor opposed Hopkinsianism on the points above stated, and advocated the positions—that self-love is the spring of all moral action; that the sinner has natural ability (as power to the contrary) to repent; that the reason of the divine permission of sin may be, that God could not (from the nature of free agency) prevent all sin in a moral system. The atonement was vindicated as a governmental scheme.—The main works in this controversy were: *E. T. Fitch* (Prof. New Haven), Disc. on Nature of Sin, 1826; ibid., Inq. into Nature of Sin, 1827. *N. W. Taylor*, Concio ad Clerum, 1823—by nature we became, not are, sinners (Review by *Jos. Harvey*, '29); ibid., Review of Spring on Means of Regeneration (Christ. Spect., 1829)—self-love theory, and "suspension of the evil principle," in regeneration. This called out the Strictures of *Bennet Tyler* (b. 1783, d. 1858, Memoirs and Lects., ed. *Gale*, 1859); Review of Strictures by *Taylor* (Christ. Spect., '30); Vindication of Strictures, by *Tyler*. *Woods'* Letters to *Taylor*, '30; Review by *Taylor* (Christ. Spect., '30). Various Articles by *Taylor* and *Tyler*, in Spirit of Pilgrims, and Christ. Spect., 1832–3.—*Wilbur Fisk* (Methodist), on Predestination and Election (criticising the New Haven views), was replied to by *Fitch*, Christ. Spect., 1831 (see *Fisk*, Calv. Controversy, 1853.)—*Spring*, on Native Depravity, 1833; reviewed by *Taylor*, Christ. Spect., 1833. *D. N. Lord*, Views in Theology.—*Chauncey*

Lee, Letters from Aristarchus to Philemon, 1833; review of the same in the Evang. Mag., 1833.—*Harvey*, on Theol. Speculations in Conn., 1832.—See (*Tyler*) Letters on Origin and Progress of New Haven Theology, N. Y., 1837. *Pigeon*, in Lit. and Theol. Rev., v. vi. *Leonard Bacon*, Appeal to Cong. Ministers in Conn., 1840, Seven Letters to *G. A. Calhoun*, 1840. —*Edward Beecher*: Conflict of Ages, '53, and Concord of Ages, '59. In these two works, the theory of preexistence is applied to settle the conflicts of the schools, and vindicate the honor of God.]

[16] [As early as 1756, *Emlyn's* works were republished in Boston. *Samuel Clarke's* works were also much read. In 1785, King's Chapel, Boston (*Jas. Freeman*) altered its Liturgy on the Trinity. *Mayhew*, of Boston, and *Gay*, of Hingham, were Unitarians. The election of *Henry Ware* (b. 1764, d. 1845), to the Hollis professorship, Harvard College, 1805, was opposed on account of his Unitarian views (by *Jed. Morse*, b. 1761, d. 1826, in his True Reasons, 1805, and Appeal to the Public, 1814). *Hosea Ballou* (Universalist), in his work on the Atonement, 1805, denied the essential divinity of the Son. *Noah Worcester* (b. 1758, d. 1838), in his Review of Testimonies in Favor of Div. of Son, and his Bible News, 1810, 5th ed., 1844, and Address to Trinit. Clergy, 1814, maintained the Arian hypothesis (like *Clarke*). *T. Lindsey's* Memoirs, 1812, were republ. in part by *Morse*, and reviewed by *Worcester* in the Panoplist, 1815. (The work described the silent progress of Unitarianism in N. E.—*Belsham*, Review of Am. Unitarianism, 2d ed., Lond., 1815.)—The controversy became more decided upon the publication of *W. E. Channing's* sermon at the ordination of *Jared Sparks*, in Baltimore. *Stuart's* Letters to C., 1819; *Woods'* Letters to Unit., 1819; *Henry Ware*, Letters to Trin. and Calv., 1820; *Woods* reply to *Ware*, and *Ware's* Answer, 1822; *Andrews Norton*, True and False Religion, and Views of Calvinism, in Christ. Disciple (1820–2); *N. W. Taylor* in reply, in Christ. Spect., 1823–4; *Norton*, Statement of Reasons for not Believing the Doctrines of Trinit., in Christ. Disciple, 1819, 1833, new ed. by Abbot, 1855. *Saml. Miller*, Letters on Unitarianism; reply by *Sparks*, 1821. See *Ellis*, Half-Cent. of Unit. Controv., 1857. *De Remusat*, transl. from Rev. d. deux Mondes in Christ. Exam., May, 1857.—In their views on the person of Christ, the Am. Unitarians range from Sabellianism to Humanitarianism.]

[17] [*William Ellery Channing*, b. 1780, d. 1842. Works, 5, 1841; 6, 1846; repr. Lond., and several transl. into French and German. From Hopkins he received the principle of disinterested benevolence, without its Hopkinsian inferences. Memoir by *W. H. Channing*, 3, 1843. Comp. Westminster Rev., '50 (*Martineau*); Christ. Exam. xiv. (*Dewey*), xlv. (*Furness*); Lit. and Theol. Rev., i. (*Withington*); Democ. Rev., xii. (*Bancroft*); New Englander, viii.—*Jos. Buckminster*, d. 1810, Sermons; ed *Griesbach's* N. Test.—*Andrew Norton*, b. 1786, d. 1853, Prof. at Cambridge (see above), Genuineness of Gospels, 3, 1837–44, 2d ed., '52; New transl. Gospels, '55; Internal Evid., '55.—*Orville Dewey*, Discourses, Controv. Theol. etc., 3, 1846–7.—*G. W. Burnap*, Unitarianism, 1835; Trinity, 1845; Evid., 1855. *J. G. Palfrey*, Evid.; 1843; Jewish Scriptures; Hist. N. E., 1858.—*A. P. Peabody*, Christ. Doctrines, 1844.—*Sam. Osgood*, Christ. Biog., etc.—

W. H. Furness, Jesus and his Biographers, 1838; Hist. Jesus, 1850.—*H. W. Bellows*, Re-statements of Christ. Doctrine, 1860. *Alv. Lamson*, Church of First Three Cent., 1860.]

[18] [*Horace Bushnell*, Hartford, Ct.: on Christ. Nurture, 1847, new ed., 1860 (see Princeton Rev., 1847; Christ. Exam., xliii.; New Englander, v.; Letters to Dr. B. by Dr. Tyler, 1848; What does Dr. B. mean? 1849; Contributions of C. C., 1849); God in Christ, 1849; Christ in Theol., 1851. Princeton Rev., 1853; Reports to Hartford Central, and Fairfield West Assoc., 1850–3; Christ. Exam., xlvi. xlvii.); Nature and the Supernatural, 1858.—Dr. B.'s position is, that the Trinity is in and for the sphere of a revelation, though there may be an eternal ground for it in the Godhead.—See also, A Biblical Trinity, by Theophilus, Hartf., 1850.]

285, *e*.

[THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNITED STATES. CONTINUED.]

[The New England theology early extended its influence into the Presbyterian churches of the Middle and Western States (*Triangle Controversy*).[1] It led to the trial of *Albert Barnes* and of *Lyman Beecher* for alleged heresy,[2] and finally to the disruption of the church (1837, *Old* and *New School*).[3] The system of Edwards, in its main features had many able advocates (*Ely, Griffin, Wilson, Richards, Skinner*, and others).[4] The older Calvinism was defended by *Romeyn, Mason, Green, Miller*, the *Alexanders, Rice, Breckinridge, Thornwell, Hodge*, and others.[5]—*Perfectionism*[6] was deduced from the new divinity by *Finney* and *Mahan*.—The discussion between Professors *Park* and *Hodge* brought the extreme positions of the New and Old School to a definite statement.[7]]

[Though Locke on the Understanding, was the leading collegiate text-book in the last century, yet the idealism of Berkeley affected many theological speculations.[8] The introduction of the Scotch philosophy contributed largely to the New Haven reaction against the old Hopkinsianism; theories of ethics and of the will shaped the theological definitions. The literature of the country has been prolific in systems of mental and moral philosophy, and of logic, of a popular character.[9] The spiritual philosophy of *Coleridge*,[10] the eclecticism of *Cousin*,[11] and the transcendental (and German) speculations[12] have had their advocates; while in opposition to the Scotch school, other systems have been framed on a more independent basis (*Tappan, Hickok.*[13])

[Most of the denominations are represented by their theological periodicals.[14] Biblical learning[15] has been fostered by the labors of *Stuart, Robinson, Bush, Turner, Hackett, Barnes, Hodge, Alexander, Norton, Noyes*, and others. The best German works

on Church History have been translated, and this department of theology is cultivated with new interest.[16]

[Besides the above controversies among the Congregationalists and Presbyterians (which have been the most fruitful in a doctrinal point of view), each denomination has had its theological representatives, advocating its distinctive tenets or polity, whose writings form a large part of the church literature of the country. The Episcopal Church[17] is represented by *Johnson*, *Chandler*, *Seabury*, *White*, *Hobart*, *Bowden*, *Hopkins*, *Jarvis*, *Hawks*, *Tyng*, and others; the *Baptists*[18] by *Backus*, *Benedict*, *Wayland*, *Williams*, *Sears*, *Fuller*, etc., (the Campbellites); the *Methodists*,[19] by *Asbury*, *Bangs*, *Elliott*, *Fisk*, *Olin*, *McClintock*, *Stevens*, etc.; the *Lutherans*,[20] by *Muhlenburg*, *Hazelius*, *Kurtz*, *Mann*, *Schmucker*, and others; the *German Reformed*,[21] by *Harbaugh*, *Nevin*, and *Schaff*; the *Dutch Reformed*,[22] by *Livingston*, *Frelinghuysen*, *DeWitt*, *Cannon*, *Berg*, etc.; the *Universalists*,[23] by *Winchester*, *Ballou*, *Chapin*; and the *Annihilationists*, by *Hudson*. The *Quakers*,[24] were divided by *Elias Hicks*. The more fanatical sects[25] (*Shakers*, *Adventists*, *Spiritualists*), and the *Mormons*[26] have also had free scope, and are dying out. On the *Roman Catholics*, see § 287, note 15; on the *Swedenborgians*, § 278; *Irvingites*, § 285, note 6.)

[In the midst of all these divisions, the progress of evangelical doctrine in the United States has kept pace with the growth of the population. Christianity is here to work itself out to its full practical results, independently of the aid of the civil power. Four sources of difficulty affect its growth; the increase of Romanism, the inroads of infidelity (both of these chiefly through the foreign immigration), the institution of slavery, and the multiplicity of sects. All these practical hindrances raise questions of the highest theoretic and theological interest, which the Protestant churches are to press to their solution.]

[1] [*Gardiner Spring* (see above, note 15), pastor of the Brick Church, N. Y., 1810 (Works, 12 vols., 1854, *sq*., Attractions of Cross; Glory of Christ, etc., see note 14.) *Ezra Styles Ely* (d. 1860), Contrast of Calvinism and Hopkinsianism, 1811. *Samuel Whelpley* (d. 1817), The Triangle, 1816 (against limited atonement, inability, and immediate imputation). *Jas. P. Wilson*, Phil. (d. 1830), on Natural Ability and Moral Inability, 1819. The progress of the New England theology in the Presb. churches was favored in the West by the Plan of Union, 1801, made with the Genl. Assoc. of Conn.]

[2] [*Albert Barnes*, the commentator, was put upon trial, 1833, for his sermon on the Way of Salvation, and his Comm. on Romans: again in 1835 by Dr. Junkin; acquitted by the Assembly, 1836.—*Lyman Beecher*, Prof. in Cincin., prosecuted by *J. L. Wilson* (d. 1846), 1834–5, and ac-

quitted: see Wilson's Plea, 1837, and Beecher's Views of Theol. (Works, iii., 1853), as developed in his Trials, with Remarks on the Princeton Review (on sin, ability, imputation, etc.)—*Geo. Duffield* on trial before Presb. of Carlisle, 1832–3, for his work on Regeneration; complaint dismissed in the Assembly.]

[3] A Memorial to the Assembly, 1834, specified nine doctrinal errors current in the church. The *Act and Testimony* of the Minority (O. S.), 1834. The Old School had a majority, 1835, and recommended the abrogation of the Plan of Union. New School majority in 1836; Mr. Barnes acquitted. In the Assembly of 1837, the Plan of Union was abolished: 4 synods cut off without further trial (comprising 500 ministers and 57,724 communicants). The reasons were, 1. Opposition to the new divinity; 2. to voluntary societies; 3. Demand for rigid subscription; 4. In part, the question of slavery. The Auburn Convention (N. S.), 1837, adopted the Protest against the act of exclusion, which also gives a clear statement of the views of the New School. See *G. N. Judd*, Hist. of Division of the Presb. Church, 1852; *Z. Crocker*, Catastrophe of Presb. Church, 1838.—Among the doctrinal affirmations contained in the above protest of the New School (in reply to charges of heresy on the particular points—sixteen being enumerated in all)—the following are the most important: "God permitted the introduction of sin, not because he was unable to prevent it, but for wise and benevolent reasons, which he has not revealed".... "By a divine constitution, Adam was so the head and representative of the race, that, as a consequence of his transgression, all mankind became morally corrupt, and liable to death, temporal and eternal".... The "sufferings and death" of infants, "are to be accounted for, on the ground of their being involved in the general moral ruin of the race induced by the apostacy".... "Original sin is a natural bias to evil, resulting from the first apostacy, leading invariably and certainly to actual transgression. And all infants, as well as adults, in order to be saved, need redemption by the blood of Christ, and regeneration by the Holy Ghost".... "The sin of Adam is not imputed to his posterity in the sense of a literal transfer of personal qualities, acts, and demerit; but by reason of the sin of Adam, in his peculiar relation, the race are treated as if they had sinned. Nor is the righteousness of Christ imputed to his people in the sense of a literal transfer of personal qualities, acts and merit; but by reason of his righteousness, in his peculiar relation, they are treated as if they were righteous".... "The sufferings and death of Christ were not symbolical, governmental, and instructive only, but were truly vicarious, *i. e.*, a substitute for the punishment due to sinners. And while Christ did not suffer the literal penalty of the law, involving remorse of conscience and the pains of hell, he did offer a sacrifice, which infinite wisdom saw to be a full equivalent. And by virtue of this atonement, overtures of mercy are sincerely made to the race, and salvation secured to all who believe".... "All believers are justified, not on the ground of personal merit, but solely on the ground of the obedience and death, or, in other words, the righteousness of Christ".... "While all such as reject the Gospel of Christ do it, not by coercion, but freely—and all who embrace it, do it, not by coercion,

but freely—the reason why some differ from others is, that God has made them to differ."

[4] [On *Ely* and *Wilson*, see note 18. *Edw. D. Griffin*, Prest. Williams Coll., b. 1770, d. 1837: Life by *W. B. Sprague*, 1839; see also *Durfee's* Hist. Williams Coll.; Sermons; on Div. Efficiency, see note 10; Humble Attempt to Reconcile Differences on the Atonement, 1819 (rep. by Cong., Bd., 1859); Park-street (Boston) Lectures, 1813.—*James Richards*, Prof. Theol., Auburn, d. 1843. Lectures, with Life, by *Gridley*, 1843.—*George Duffield*, Detroit: Regeneration, 1832; on Prophecy and Millennium.—*N. S. S. Beman*, Troy: Episcopal Contro.; Discourses; Atonement (see Princeton Essays, i.)—*Samuel H. Cox*, Quakerism not Christ.; ed. Bower's Popes; Remarkable Interviews.—*Thos. H. Skinner*: Aids to Preaching; Sermons; transl. of Vinet, etc.]

[5] [*J. B. Romeyn*, New York, d. 1825: Sermons, 2 vols.—*John M. Mason*, d. 1829 (distinguished as a preacher); Works, 4 vols., on Episcopacy; the Church; Communion, etc.—*Ashbel Green*, d. 1848: ed. Christ. Advocate; Hist. N. J. College; Lects. on Cat. 2, 1841; Discourses.—*S. Stanhope Smith*, Prest. N. J. Coll., d. 1812: Human Species, 1788; Evidences, 1809; Moral Phil.; Nat. and Rev. Religion.—*Saml. Miller*, Princeton, d. 1850: Retrospect 18th Cent., 1801; Order of Ministry, 1807; Unitarianism (*Sparks*), 1821; Sonship of Christ (*Stuart*), 1823.—*Archibald Alexander*, Princeton, d. 1851: Evidences; Justif.; Canon; Moral Phil.; Hist. Israelites.—*John H. Rice*, Va., d. 1831: Pamphleteer, 1820; ed. Va. Evang. Mag.—*Thos. Smyth*, S. C., on Presb. and Prelacy; the Trinity.—*Jas. W. Alexander*, New York, d. 1859: Discourses and essays.—*N. L. Rice*, Divine Sovereignty; R. C. Controv., etc.—*J. H. Thornwell*, S. C., Apocrypha; theological essays and reviews.—*R. J. Breckinridge*, Ky., Knowledge of God, Objective and Subjective, 2, N. Y., 1858–9.—*Charles Hodge*, Princeton: Essays and Reviews, 1857; Commentaries; ed. Princeton Review.—*A. A. Hodge*, Outlines of Theol., 1860.—*Saml. J. Baird*, The First Adam and the Second: the Elohim Revealed, 1860; against immediate and antecedent imputation; see Princeton Rev., April, 1860; So. Presb. Quart. (*Thornwell*), 1860; Baird's Rejoinder to Princeton, 1860.—*Griffin, Geo.*, a lawyer of N. Y., d. 1860, in a work on the Sufferings of Christ, 2d ed., 1846, advocated the view that the divine nature suffered.]

[6] [*Asa Mahan*, Oberlin: Christ's Perfection; Woods' Reply, see above, and Am. Bib. Rep., 2d s. i. ii. iv.; Princeton Rev. xiii. xiv. *C. G. Finney*, Oberlin: Lectures on Revivals, 13th ed., 1840; Sermons, 1839; Lects. on Syst. Theol., new ed. by Bedford, 1851. See Princeton Rev. (Hodge), 1847; *Rand*, in Volunteer, and New Divinity Tried, and Vindication, 1832.]

[7] [*Edwards A. Park*: The Theology of the Intellect and of the Feelings; a Discourse before the Convention of Cong. Ministers of Mass., 1850 (Bib. Sacra, vii.); Remarks on Bibl. Repert. (Bib. Sac. viii.); Unity amid Diversities of Belief (Bib. Sac. viii.); New England Theol. (ix.). *Chas. Hodge*, three articles in Princeton Rev., reprinted in his Essays and Reviews, p. 529, *sq.*—Review of Prof. Park's Disc. in Lit. and Theol. Rev., 1850.—*Daniel Dana*, Remonstrance to the Trustees of Phillips Acad., 1853.—Review of Dr. *Dana's* Remonstrance by a Layman, 1853.—Views in New

Eng. Theology, Nos. 1, 2, Boston, 1859.—The three main points of New England theology, in Professor Park's view, are "that sin consists in choice, that our natural power equals, and that it also limits our duty." The opposing position was, that the older New England divines did not hold these three principles in this unlimited, and abstract form; and that they cannot properly be exalted to the rank of essential points in a system of Christian theology.]

[8] [*Berkeley's* (see § 285, *a*, note 16) speculations were a frequent theme of discussion. His theory was adopted by *Samuel West*, of New Bedford, and by *Samuel Johnson* (who became an Episcopalian, see note 17, below); and his influence can be distinctly traced in the works of Stephen West and of Emmons.]

[9] [*Witherspoon* and *S. Stanhope Smith*, wrote on Moral Philosophy. All the leading New England divines elaborated the theory of ethics (Edwards, Hopkins, Emmons, Burton, Dwight, Taylor). *J. Macpherson*, Moral Phil., Phila., d. 1791.—*F. Beasley*, d. '48, Search after Truth, '22.—*Jasper Adams*, d. '41, Moral Phil., '37.—*Chs. J. C. Follen*, d. 1840 (a German), Works, 5, '41, on Moral Phil. and Psychology.—*T. C. Upham*, Bowd. Coll., Mental Phil., The Will, etc.—*Jas. Richards*, Mental and Moral Phil.—*R. H. Bishop*, d. '55, Logic, '33; Science of God, '39.—*Jeremiah Day*, Prest. Yale, on Edwards on Will, '41; on Self-Determining Power, '49.—*Francis Wayland*, Moral Phil. (numerous editions); Intel. Phil., '44; Pol. Econ.—*Archibald Alexander*, Moral Science, '52.—*S. A. Sawyer*, Mental Phil., '39.—*Francis Bowen*, Cambr., Critical Essays, '42; Ethical and Metaph. Science, '47.—*Jas. Walker*, Prest. Cambr., ed. *Reid* and *Stewart*.—*F. E. Brewster*, Phil. Hum. Nature, Phila., 1851.—*R. Hildreth*, Morals, '44.—*Jos. Haven*, Chicago, Mental Phil., '57; Moral Phil., '59.—*H. Winslow*, Moral Phil., '56.—*J. L. Dagg*, Elements of Moral Science, 1860.—*Henry Carleton*, Liberty and Necessity, Phil., 1857.—*W. D. Wilson*, Logic, 1856.—*J. T. Champlin*, Intel. Phil., 1859.—*Samuel Tyler*, Baconian Phil., '46; Essays, '56.—*Coppee*, Logic, 1857.]

[10] [*Coleridge's* Friend and Aids to Reflection were republished 1831–40 with an able Preliminary Essay, by Prest. *Jas. Marsh*, Burlington, Vt. (b. 1794, d. 1842: Remains, ed. by *Torrey*, 2d ed., 1845: Systematic Arrangement of Knowledge; Remarks on Psychology, on the Will of the Spiritual Principle in Man). *Coleridge's* Works, ed. by *W. G. T. Shedd* (Andover), who has also published Lects. on Phil. of Hist., 1850; Discourses and Essays, 1856. [*J. Tracy*] Essay on Christ. Philos., Andov., 1848.]

[11] [*Cousin*, Introd. to Hist. of Phil., transl. by *Linberg*, Bost., 1832; Course of Mod. Phil., by *O. W. Wight*, 2, 1852–4; Philos. of Beautiful, by *J. C. Daniel*, 1849; Psychology, by *C. S. Henry*, 4th ed.: Selections, by *Geo. Ripley* (in Phil. Miscl.), 1838. See North Am. 53 (*Bowen*), 85; Brownson, in Christ. Exam., 21; Am. Qu. Rev., 10. *Day* on Cousin's Psychology in Christ. Qu. Spect., 7.—*C. S. Henry* has also publ. Comp. Christ. Antiq., '37; Moral Phil. Essays, '39; Epitome of Hist., Phil., from French, 2, 1845.—*Asa Mahan*, Intel. Phil., new ed., '54; Logic, '57; Moral Phil., 48; The Will.]

[12] [The transcendental philosophy led to a controversy between *Andrews*

Norton and *Geo. Ripley*; *Ripley*, Disc. on Phil. of Religion, 1836; *Norton*, The Latest Form of Infidelity, 1839; *Ripley*, Letter on the same (including a View of the Opinions of Spinoza, Schleiermacher, and De Wette), 1840; *Norton*, Remarks on the same.—Comp. on Transcendentalism, Princeton Rev. xi. xii.; Am. Bib. Rep., 3d s. i.; Christ. Exam., xxi. xxii. (*Bowen*); Brownson's Quart., ii.; New Englander, i.—*A. Kaufmann*, transl. *Beckshammer*, on the Will, 1835.—*Stallo*, General Principles of Philos. of Nature (Schelling, Oken, Hegel), Bost., 1848.—*F. A. Rauch* (Mercersburg), Psychology, 1835.—*E. V. Gerhart*, Philos. and Logic, 1858.—This general transcendental movement became deistic in *Theodore Parker* (d. 1859: Sermons on Theism; Miscellanies; of Religion; Popular Theology; Addresses); and pantheistic in *Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Essays, two series; Addresses; Poems; Representative Men; Conduct of Life).—*J. W. Miles*, Philosophic Theology, '49; Ground of Morals, '52.—*Henry James*, Nature of Evil, '55; Christianity the Logic of Creation, '57.]

[13] [*Henry P. Tappan*, Chancellor of Univ. Michigan, Review of Edwards, 3; Logic, 1844 and 1857.—*Laurens P. Hickok*, Union Coll., Rational Psychology, 1849, 2d ed., 1860; Science of the Mind in Consciousness, 1854; Moral Philos.; Christian Cosmology, 1858—The general method of Kant, with positive and Christian results. See *Lewis*, in Bib. Sacra, 1850, 1851; Christian Remembrancer, July, 1853; New Englander, Feb., 1857; Princeton Rev., 1859; Am. Theol. Rev., 1860.]

[14] [Conn. Evang. Mag. (*Backus*), 1806–7; Panoplist (*Morse*), 1806, *sq.*; Christian Disciple, 1813–24 (*Ware*), since 1824, the Christ. Examiner (Unit.), now ed. by *Hedge*.—Christ. Spect., Monthly, 1819–28; quarterly to 1834, New Haven; Spirit of Pilgrims (Cong.), 1829–33; Mag. of Ref. Dutch Church, 1826–30; Princeton Repository, Presb. (*Hodge*), since 1849; Am. Qu. Obs. (*B. B. Edwards*), 1833–4; Christ. Rev. (Bapt.), since 1836; Lit. and Theol. Rev. (*L. Woods*), 1834–9; Meth. Qu., 4 series, since 1819; Universalist Qu., since 1844; So. Meth. Qu., since 1847; Church Rev. (Episc.), since 1848; Evangel. Rev. (Lutheran), since 1849; Deutsche Kirchenfreund, monthly, since 1847; Theol. and Lit. Journal (*Lord*), since 1849; Biblical Repository (*Robinson* and *Edwards*), Andov., 1831–7, New York (*Peters*, *Agnew*, *Sherwood*), 1837 to 1850; Bibliotheca Sacra, i. 1843 (*Robinson*), 1844, *sq.* (*Park*, *Taylor*); New Englander (New Haven) since 1843; Brownson's Quart., since 1844 Rom. Cath.; Southern Presb. (Columbia, S. C.), since 1848; Presb. Quart. (*Wallace*), Phil., since 1852; Prot. Episc. Quart., N. Y., since 1854; Free Will Baptist Quart., since 1857; Cong. Quart., 1859; Am. Theol. Rev., 1859; Danville Quart. (Presb.), 1861; Evang. Rev. (Ref. Dutch, *Bery*), 1860; United Presb. Quart., 1860; Boston Review (Cong.), 1861.]

[15] [*Moses Stuart*, Prof. Andover, 1810–1852; Heb. Gram., 1821, 6 editions; Chrestomathy; Ep. to Hebr., '27, 3d ed., *Robbins*, '59; Romans, '32, 3d ed., *Robbins*; Notes to Hug, '36; New Test. Gram.; Apocalypse, 2, 45; O. Test. Canon, '45; Miscel., '46; Daniel, '50; Eccles., '51; Proverbs, '52; Letters to Channing and Miller (on Eternal Generation, '22); Diss. on Original Lang. of Bible, 2d ed., '27; Transl. of Gesenius' Hebr. Gram., and Defence of the same, '47.—*Edward Robinson*, Prof. in Andov.,

1830, in New York, '37; Winer's Gram.; Wahl's Clavis, '25; Buttmann's Gram., '33; N. Test. Lex., '36 and '50; Hebr. Lex.; Bibl. Res. in Palest. 3, '43, new ed., '55; Harmony of Gospels, '45; Eng. Harm., '46.—*Isaac Nordheimer*, Hebr. Gram., '42.—*George Bush*, d. 1859: Script. Illustrat.; Millennium, '32; Hebrew Gr., '35; Anastasis, '44; Pent. Josh., '40 to '58; ed. New Jerusl. Mag.—*Saml. H. Turner* (Prot. Episc.), Jahn and Planck's Introd.; Jewish Rabbies, '47; Prophecy, '52; Rom., Hebr., new ed., '59.—*Elias Riggs* (Constple.), Manual of Chaldee, '24, new ed., '56.—*H. B. Hackett*, ed. Winer's Chaldee Gram.; Acts, 2d ed., '52.—*Albert Barnes*. Comm. on New Test.; Job; Isaiah, etc.—*Charles Hodge*, Ep. to Romans, '35, abridged, '36; 15th ed. Phil., '56; Ephes., '56; 1 Cor., '57; Hist. Presb. Church, 2, '40; Way of Life, 30th ed., '56, etc.—*Jos. Addison Alexander*, Princeton, b. 1809, d. 1860 (Princeton): Isaiah, 2, '46–7; Psalms, 3, '50; Essays on Prim. Church.—*H. J. Ripley* (Bapt.), Gospels; Rom.; Acts.—*J. J. Owen* (N. Y.), Gospels, 1858–60.—*D. D. Whedon*, Gospels Matth., Mk., 1860.—*F. G. Hibbard*, Psalms.—*Justin Edwards*, d. 1853, New Test.—*Jas. Strong*, Harm. and Expos. of Gospels.—*G. R. Noyes* (Cambr.), Job, Psalms, Prophets.—*Andrews Norton* (Cambr.), New transl. Gospels, Genuineness of Gospels, '52–'55.—*M. Jacobus*, Gospels.—*F. S. Sampson*, Hebr., '56.—*T. V. Moore*, Haggai, etc., 56.—On Apocalypse, *D. N. Lord*, '47; *Macdonald*; *Weeks*, '51.—Abp. *Kenrick*, New Test. transl. from Vulgate, '47–'51.—*T. J. Conant*, Rochester, Rödiger's Gesenius; transl. of Job and New Test. (in progress). *A. C. Kendrick*, Olshausen's Comm. revised, 6 vols., 1858.]

[16] [*Neander*, transl. by Prof. *Torrey*, 5 vols., 1840–54. *Hase* by *Blumenthal* and *Wing*, '55.—*Mosheim's* Institutes, 3, 1832, frequent editions, and Commentaries on First Three Cent., '51, by *Jas. Murdock* (d. 1856); also transl. *Münscher's* Dogmat. Hist., '30, and the Syriac N. Test., '61.—*Guericke*, i. by *G. W. T. Shedd*.—*Kurtz*, Sacred Hist. by *Schaeffer*, '57.—*Gieseler*, Hist. to Ref. by *F. Cunningham*, 3, '42; revision of Davidson's Edinb. Version, by *H. B. Smith*, continued to 1648, 4 vols., New York, 1857–'61.—*P. Schaff*, Apostol. Church, '53, Hist. of Church, i., '58.—*Coleman's* Ancient Christ., '52.—*M. Mahan*, Church Hist. of First Three Cent., 1860.]

[17] [The Church of England was established in the southern colonies; in Maryland after the decline of the Roman Catholic influence (1692); and in New York after its cession by the Dutch, (1693). Frequent projects of appointing bishops in the other colonies failed. The first controversy in New England was (1720) between *John Checkley* (d. 1753), and *Ed. Wigglesworth* (Prof. Cambr., d. 1765). In 1722 *Tim. Cutler* (d. 1756), *S. Johnson* and others in Ct. became Episcopalians. The latter wrote in defence of the Epis. Church (1733); A Syst. of Morality, '46; Hebr. Gram., '67; d. Pres. King's Coll., '72. *Noah Hobart* (Fairfield, Ct., d. 1773), wrote: Serious Address to the Episcopal Separation, '48; Second Address, '51. *J. Wetmore*, (d. '60): Vindication of Professors of Church of England, '47; and Rejoinder to Hobart. *J. Beach* (d. 1782): Answer to Hobart '49; Vindication, '56. Prest. *Dickinson*, Reasonableness of Nonconformity, '38; Second Vindication, etc. (see *Allen's* Biog. Dict.) In 1763, *East Apthorp*, controversy with Dr.

Mayhew, on the Plans of the Propag. Society; *Mayhew*, on Conduct of the Society, and two Defences, 1763–5. The Abp. of Canterb. (*Secker*) replied to Mayhew. *T. B. Chandler* (d. 1790): Appeal on behalf of Chh. of Eng., '67; Defence, '69, '71. *Chauncy* of Boston, Remarks on Bp. of Llandaff's Sermon, '67; Answer to Chandler, '68, '70; Complete View of Episcopacy, '71. After the Revolution, episcopal ordination was obtained in Scotland, 1781, by *Samuel Seabury* (d. 1796), in England by *Bp. White* (d. 1836). On the proposed alteration in the Liturgy, see § 222, note 6. In 1811, Bp. *Hobart* of N. Y. (d. 1830), advocated High Church claims in his Companion for the Altar; *J. M. Mason*, replied in Christ. Mag.; *Hobart*, Apology for Apostolic Order. *John Bowden* (d. 1817), advocated Episcopacy against *Stiles*, 1778; against *Miller*, 1806–10 (*Miller's* Order of Ministry, 1807; reply to Bowden, 1810.) Bp. *H. U. Onderdonk* (Phil., d. 1858), Episcopacy tested by Script., 1830; reply by *Albert Barnes*, 1844. *Wainwright* and *Potts'* discussion on the theme; a Church without a Bishop. (Comp. *Woods* on Episc. '44; *Smyth*, Prelacy; *Coleman's* Prim. Church; *Jos. A. Alexander*, Prim. Church Officers, '51). The Oxford Controversy had its echoes in America. Between 1815 and 1858, 38 of the Episcopal Clergy went to Rome (Bp. *Ives*, 1852). Bp. *Hopkins* of Vt., wrote on Church of Rome, '37, and Novelties, '44; Confessional, '50; End of Controversy, '54. Bp. *McIlvaine*, on Justif., '40; Oxf. Div., '41; Apostolic Office, '55 (see Princeton Rev., '56). Other Episcopal Divines, *S. F. Jarvis* (d. '51), Regen., '21; Prophecy, '43; Introd. to Chh. Hist., '45; Reply to Milner, '47; Chh. of Redeemed, '50. Bp. *Ravenscroft*, d. 1730: Disc. and Controv. with J. H. Rice. *Samuel Seabury*, Continuity of Chh. of Eng., '55; Am. Slavery Justified, '60. *J. O. Ogilby* (Prof. N. Y., d. '51), on the Chh. and Lay Baptism, '44. *F. L. Hawks*, N. Y., Eccl. Hist. of Md. and Va.; Egypt; Chris. Antiq. *Murray Hoffman* (jurist) Canon Law, '51. *John S. Stone*, The Mysteries opened (on Baptismal Regeneration and the Real Presence), 1844; The Church Universal, '46. *Stephen H. Tyng*, Law and Gospel, '48; Israel of God; Christ is all, 1849.]

[18] [The Baptist Controversy is perpetually renewed. Among the leading divines of this denomination are: *Isaac Backus*, b. 1724, d. 1806, Hist. of Baptists, 3 vols., to 1801; Mem. by *A. Hovey*, 1858. *David Benedict*, Hist. Bapt., new ed., '48; Compend. Eccles. Hist.; Fifty Years among Baptists, '60. *Jas. Maxcy* (Prest. Brown Univ., d. '20), Disc. and Remains (Elton). *Francis Wayland* (Prest. of Brown), b. 1796; Sermons; Moral and Intel. Phil.; Pol. Econ.; on Slavery (*Fuller*); Principles of Baptists, '56, etc. *Wm. R. Williams* (N. Y.), Miscel.; Rel. Progress; Lord's Prayer, etc. *Barnas Sears* (Prest. Brown), on Education; Addresses and Reviews. *R. Fuller* on Baptism, Slavery (*Wayland*), Close Communion, '49. *T. F. Curtis*, Progress of Baptist Principles, '57. *S. S. Cutting*, Hist. Vindication, '59.—The *Campbellites* are named from *Alex. Campbell*, editor of Christ. Bapt., '23–'29, of Millennial Harbinger, since '30; Christ. System; Baptism; Infidelity refuted by Infidels; Public Debates with Walker, McAlla, Purcell and Rice; Debate with *Owen* on Socialism. See *J. B. Jeter*, Campbellism Examined, 1858.]

[19] [In 1784 the First Methodist Conference was organized under Wesley's

rules. In 1860, the total of Methodists in America, was 1,880 269. *Francis Asbury*, d. 1816, preached 17,000 Sermons; Journals, 3 vols.; Life by Strickland, '59. Bp. *Emory*, Defence of Fathers; Episc. Controversy; Hist. Discipline. *N. Bangs*, on Meth. Ep. Church; Original Church of Christ; Sanctif. *Chs. Elliott*, Delineation of Rom. Catholicism, 2, N. Y. (3d ed., Lond., '51); Bible and Slavery; Baptism, '34; Hist. of Secession of Southern Chh. *G. Peck*, Christ. Perfection; Rule of Faith. *W. Fisk*, d. 1830; Predest. and Elect. (against Fitch). *Stephen Olin*, d. '51, Sermons and Addresses. *J. McClintock*, Temporal Power of Pope, '55; ed. Classical Works. *Abel Stevens*, Chh. Polity; Memorials of Method.; Rel. Movement in 18th cent., i., ii., 1858–60.]

[20] [On the early German emigration to United States, see *W. M. Reynolds*, in Evang. Review, July, 1861. *Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, d. 1787; Reports in Hallische Nachrichten, 1741–85; Life by *Stover*. The Lutherans are divided into (1), the strict Old Lutheran—controversy 1850, between Missouri and Buffalo Synods (*Löber*, *Walther*); (2.) Moderate Lutheranism of the Penn. synod; (3.) Evangelical Lutherans (Gettysburg). The American Lutherans generally reject the strict doctrine of consubstantiation; the discipline is stricter than in the European churches; the government more Presbyterian.—For a full literature of the denomination, see Evang. Review, April, 1861.—*J. C. Kunze*, d. 1802, orientalist.—*J. G. Lochmann*, d. 1826, Hist. Lutheran Doctrine, 1818.—*J. Bachmann* (S. C.), Defence of Luther; Unity of Race, etc.—*E. L. Hazelius*, Hist. of Church, i. '42; of Am. Luth., '46; Life of Stilling. *C. W. Shäffer*, Early Hist. Luth., '57.—*B. Kurtz*, Why a Luth., '43; Inf. Bapt., '48. *W. J. Mann*, Luth. in Am., '57; Plea for Augsb. Conf., '56. *J. G. Morris*, Life of Arndt, '53; on Martin Behaim, '55. *J. A. Seiss*, on Hebrews, '46; Baptist System, 2d ed., '58; Gospel in Lev., '60; Digest of Doctrine, '57. *A.* and *S. Henkel*, Transl. of Luther on Sacraments, '53; of Book of Concord, '54. *S. S. Schmucker* (Prof. Gettysburg), Storr and Flatt transl., 2, '26; Appeal on Union, '38; Psychology, '42; Am. Luth. Church, '51; Lutheran Manual, '55; Am. Lutheranism Vindicated (reply to *Mann*), '56; Formula of Gov. and Discipline. See *J. A. Brown*, The New Theology, '57, and *Schmucker* in reply.]

[21] [The German Reformed were at first united with the Dutch.—Dr. *Mayer*, d. 1849, Hist. of Ref. Church.—*H. Harbaugh*, Fathers of Germ. Ref. Church; The Future Life, etc. *J. W. Nevin*, Bibl. Antiq.; Mystical Presence, '46; Heidelb. Catechism, '47, and a series of articles in the Mercersb. Review on Puritanism, the Cyprianic Church, etc. See in reply, *Hodge* in Princeton Rev., '48, *Schmucker* and *Berg*; also Brownson's Quart. and *Ebrard* (approving Nevin's views) in Studien und Kritiken, '51. On *P. Schaff* (comp. note 16); he has also written on the Sünde wider den heiligen Geist; Principles of Protestantism, '45; What is Church History? '46; America, '55; Germany and its Universities, '57; edited Deutsche Kirchenfreund, '48–'53, and Mercersb. Rev., and contributed numerous articles to Bib. Sacra and other reviews.]

[22] [The Dutch Ref. Church was first established in New Amsterdam (New York), under the classis of Amsterdam; Domine Everardus Bogardus,

1633–47; S. Megapolensis, 1642–68. 1737–71, a strong movement against the dependence on Holland—*Cœtus* and *Conferentie* parties; the Cœtus party at last succeeded. First preaching exclusively in English by *A. Laidlée*, d. '78. The Decrees of Dort and the Heidelberg Catechism are the standards. *J. H. Livingston*, Prof. Theol. (b. 1746, d. 1855); Sermons and Addresses; Life by *Gunn*, '56. *Theod. J. Frelinghuysen*, d. 1754, Sermons, ed. *De Witt*, '56.—*W. C. Brownlee*, on Quakers, '24; on Popery; West. Apost. Church; Rom. Cath. Controv.; Deity of Christ. *Thos. De Witt*, Hist. Disc., '58, etc. *D. D. Demarest*, Hist., Ref. D. Church, '59. *J. S. Cannon*, d. 1850, Lect. on Pastoral Theology, '53. *W. R. Gordon*, Godhead of Christ, 1855. *Jos. F. Berg* (Germ. Ref. till '52), Lect. on Romanism, '40; Theology of Dens, '40; Papal Rome; Voice from Rome; Pope and Presbyterians, '44; Robe of Trèves; Myst. of Inquis., '46; Reply to Abp. Hughes, '50; Farewell Words to Germ. Ref. Church and Nevin, '52; Prophecy, '56, etc.]

[23] [*John Murray*, from England, b. 1741, d. 1815, formed the first Universalist Society in Am., 1779; Letters and Sermons, 3, 1816. *Chs. Chauncy*, in Boston (see § 285, *d.*, note 7), taught the doctrine in his Salvation of All Men, 1784 (reply by *Jonathan Edwards*, Jr., '85), and *Jos. Huntington*, of Coventry, Ct. (d. 1795), in his Calvinism Improved, publ. 1796; replies by *Strong*, of Hartford, and others.—*Elhanan Winchester* (b. 1751, d. '97): Univ. Restoration, 1786; on Prophecies, 2, 1800.—*Hosea Ballou*, d. 1851, Orthodoxy Unmasked; Divine Benevolence, 1815; Atonement, 1805–1828.—*Hosea Ballou*, 2d, d. 1861: Univ. Expositor, 1831; Ancient Hist. Universalism.—*W. Balfour*, d. 1812: Inquiry; Essays; Letters to Stuart, etc.—*E. H. Chapin*, Characters in Gospels; Lord's Prayer; Humanity in City, '54.—The *Annihilationists: Geo. Storrs*, Are the Wicked Immortal, 21st ed., '59. *C. F. Hudson*, Debt and Grace, '57; Human Destiny, a Critique of Universalism, '61. See *Alvah Hovey*, State of Impenitent Dead, 59: *J. R. Thompson*, Law and Penalty: *R. W. Landis*, Immortality, etc., 2d ed., '60. Abp. *Whately*, Scriptl. Revel. respecting Future State, '55.]

[24] [The Quakers (Society of Friends) had trouble, 1692, with *George Keith*, who organized the Christian Quakers, and at last became an Episcopalian. The Quaker predominance in Penn. came to an end, about 1755, in the discussions on men and supplies for the French war. No Friend was allowed to hold slaves (*John Woolman*, Epistle to Quakers, 1773. *Benezet* (d. 1784) aroused the zeal of Clarkson in England).—A division, 1827, by *Elias Hicks* (d. 1830), who denied the divine authority of the Scriptures, and the deity and atonement of Christ. Separate organizations formed (150,000 regular, and 10,000 Hicksite Quakers.)]

[25] [The *Shakers* began in England (called Millennial Church), with *Jas.* and *Jane Wardley*, Bristol, 1747. Mother Ann Lee joined them, 1757, and became the *spiritual mother;* emigrated to America, 1774, Watervleit, N. Y., d. 1784. Strict celibacy; Christ's Second Coming (4th dispensation began in 1847). See *Evans'* Hist., 1859; A Summary View of the Millennial Church, Albany, 1823.—*Adventists: Wm. Miller* preached in 1833, that the end of the world would be in 1843: *J. V. Hines*, Advent Herald,

1840. *Spiritualism* (Rappings, Necromancy) began 1850, with the *Fox* family, *Andrew Jackson Davis*, Harmonia, 6, 1850; Nature's Div. Revel.; Philos. of Spiritual Intercourse; Harmonial Man, etc. *J. W. Edmonds*, Spiritualism, 2, 1853–5. *Owen*, Footfalls on the Boundaries, etc., 1860. See *Asa Mahan*, Mod. Myst. Explained, Bost., 1856. Modern Necromancy, in North Am. Rev., 1855; Christ. Exam., Nov., 1756 (*Hill*); Church Rev., July, 1855; Westminster, Jan., 1858. *W. R. Gordon*, Threefold Test of Modern Spiritualism, N. Y., 1856; *Agenor de Gasparin*, Science *vs.* Spiritualism, 2, 1856 (transl. by *E. W. Roberts*). The Literature of Spiritualism, New Englander, 1858. North Brit., Feb., 1861, on *Edmonds* and *Owen*.]

[26] [*Mormons, Latter Day Saints. Joe Smith*, b. 1805, published *Sol. Spalding's* (d. 1816) Romance on the American Aborigines (Nephi and Lehi), as the Book of Mormons, 1830. The church founded with three high priests, twelve apostles, twenty elders: temple in Nauvoo, 1842: Smith killed. *Brigham Young* succeeded; in 1856 emigration to Utah. They may now number 60,000 in Utah. Gifts of tongues and prophecy; polygamy practised. See *J. B. Turner*, Mormonism in all Ages. Accounts by *Bennet*, 1843; *Gunnison*, 1852; *Ferris*, 1854; *Green*, 1858; *Hyde*, 1859; Edb. Rev., April, 1854; New Englander, Nov., 1854; *Jules Remy*, Voyage au Pays des Mormons, 2, Paris, 1860; *T. W. P. Taylder*, The Mormons' Own Book, Lond., 1855.—The Book of Doctrines and Covenants; Kirtland, O., 1835; Nauvoo, 1846; and a 3d ed. in England.]

§ 286.

CONFLICTS OF THE CONFESSIONS.

It was characteristic of the theology of the eighteenth century that it attached less importance to the denominational differences of the confessions of faith, upon which so much stress had been laid in the preceding period. These differences had receded in view of the new and fresh antagonisms. The cause of this was not only rationalistic indifferentism, but also the efforts of the Pietists, and other sects of a similar character, for the promotion of practical piety.[1] Although the union of Catholicism with Protestantism was restricted to pious and impracticable wishes,[2] yet on the other hand, in several parts of Germany a union was brought about between the Lutherans and the Calvinists.[3] But even this union led to a revival of the former denominational differences, which were not only made the subject of scientific discussion,[4] but also gave rise to separations and commotions in the church.[5] Thus Scriptural Supernaturalism, as well as old Lutheran orthodoxy,[6] and the rigid Calvinism[7] of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, were strongly defended in the nineteenth. The work of union has been very much shattered by this dogmatic partisan hatred.

[1] Comp. *Urlsperger*, (§ 277, note 6), *Zinzendorf* (§ 277).

[2] Did *Lavater* and *Sailer* labor to effect such a union?—Connection of the literary romantic school with the catholicising tendency in the Protestant church.—Conversion and proselytism. See the works on Church History [*Hase*, *Gieseler*, *Niedner*, *Guericke*.]

[3] 1817–30: Prussia, Nassau, Baden, the electorate of Hesse, Hesse-Darmstadt, Würtemberg. Compare the works on ecclesiastical history.

[4] Among the writers on systematic theology, *Augusti*, previous to the establishment of the Union, showed the necessity of enabling the students of theology to obtain a more thorough knowledge of the systematic theology of the Lutheran Church which even Lessing held to be more than "a patchwork of blunderers and semi-philosophers," in his work: *System der Christlichen Dogmatik, nach dem Lehrbegriff der lutherischen Kirche*, im Grundrisse dargstellt, Leipz., 1809—Respecting particular doctrines, see the special history of doctrines (Lord's Supper, Predestination, etc.). The revived study of symbolism, see § 282, also helped in this matter.

[5] *Scheibel* in Breslau and *Steffens* (who wrote: Wie ich wieder ein Lutheraner wurde und, Was mir das Lutherthum ist, Breslau, 1831), *Guericke*, (1835), *Kellner*, *Wehrhahn*, and others. Concerning the commotions to which these conflicts gave rise, see the works on ecclesiastical history, *e. g.* Hase, p. 569, ss., and *H. Olshausen*. Was ist von den neuesten kirchlichen Ereignissen in Schlesien zu halten? Leipz., 1835. *Niedner*, p. 888 sq.

[6] *Rudelbach* und *Guericke*, Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche, from the year 1840. *Rudelbach*, Reformation, Lutherthum und Union, Leipz., 1839. Somewhat later we find the camp of the Ultra-Lutherans itself divided into fractions: see *Gieseler*, Kirchengeschichte der neuesten Zeit, Bonn, 1855, pp. 213, 277. The Lutherans represented by the Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche, edited by *Thomasius* and *Hofman*. [Theologische Zeitschrift, 1860. *K. F. A. Kahnis*, Die moderne Unions-doctrin, Leipz., 1853; *K. J. Nitzsch*, Würdigung der Augriffe des Dr. Kahnis, 1854: *Kahnis*, Die Sache der lutherischen Kirche gegenüber die Union, 1854.—The chief works in this controversy are *Julius Müller*, Die evang. Union, 1854, and *F. J. Stahl* (d. 1861), Die lutherische Kirche und die Union, 2te Aufl., 1860. *Baur*, Dogmengeschichte, p. 356, represents the course of things thus: the church in opposition to the new philosophic speculations could not take any other consistent standpoint than that of the older Confessions; but as soon as they come back to them earnestly, the old conflicts of the symbols must break out anew.]

[7] Among the Momiers in the Church of Geneva (comp. § 285, note 9), in the Netherlands and in the district of Elberfeld; yet it can not be pretended, that there was a revival of older Calvinism, like that of old Lutheranism (*Neidner*, 885).

§ 287.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH. GERMAN-CATHOLICISM.

The development of the Roman Catholic Church in *Germany* was different from that in *France;* for these two countries alone here come into consideration.[1] In the former country Romanism was affected by the influence of the philosophical systems, and the prevailing tendency of the age. While some Roman Catholics, especially as favored in the reign of Joseph II., Emperor of Austria, directed their efforts chiefly to the reform of the government of the church,[2] there were others who sought partly to rationalize (*auf*klären),[3] and partly to idealise (*ver*klären) the Roman Catholic doctrine.[4] Here the modern speculation led through the indefinite views of the older rationalism, to a more profound and philosophical advocacy of their doctrines in their conscious distinction from those of the Protestant Church. This was the case especially with *Hermes*[5] and *Möhler*,[6] and *Günther*,[7] though with different degrees of success. In France the Jansenistic controversy was continued at the commencement of the present period in the controversy concerning the Constitution.[8] From the time of the French Revolution, theological conflicts appear so intimately connected with political contests, as to preclude the expectation that even those highly talented men who took a prominent part in these conflicts,[9] would do much for the scientific development of theology. The theological system of *Bautain* is of special importance in its relation to the theology of Hermes. The former tried to prove on speculative ground, that speculation is not admissible in systematic theology, and rested his system entirely upon faith,[10] while Hermes endeavoured to establish faith by philosophy. Both systems were condemned by the Papal See as being founded on extreme views. The so-called *German Catholicism* troubled itself less about dogmatic principles. Called into being by an extreme Roman Catholic superstition,[11] it planted itself upon a rationalistic eclecticism ;[12] and though a fraction sought to save more positive elements, yet it was devoid of thorough theological basis.[13] [The Roman Catholic literature of England,[14] and the United States of America,[15] has been chiefly historical and controversial.]

[1] Among the Italian theologians, the most eminent is Cardinal *Perrone*, Prof. in the Collegium Romanum : Prælectiones Theologicæ Rom., 1835 ; in German, Landshut, 1852. [Some 25 editions of this work, and its abridgment have been published; Perrone has also written on the Rule of Faith (Latin and French), 3 vols., 1853; on the Immaculate Conception,

1848; Theology and Philosophy, 1845. Perrone was born 1794, and became Prof. in Rome, 1823.—*Pellicia*, Prof. in Naples, d. 1823, and *Passaglia*, the editor of the Eccles. Christi Monumenta de immacul. Virginis Conceptu, are the two other most eminent Italian divines of the century.—Among the Italian philosophers, *Galluppi*, of Naples, d. 1846, taught in the spirit of Reid; *Ventura* (b. 1792), on Philos. Reason and Catholic Reason, and on the Origin of Ideas, 1853, interpreted reason by the light of the Council of Trent.—The two great Italian philosophers of the century are *Vicenzo Gioberti*, d. 1852, and *Antonio Rosmini* (*Serbati*), d. 1855, both of them vigorous opponents of the pantheistic school. *Gioberti* wrote on the Moral Primacy of Italy; the Jesuits; the Good and the Beautiful; Theory of Supernatural; posthumous, 7 vols. (Philos. of Revel., and Protology). His formula is *Deus creat existentias*. Comp. Westminster Rev., Oct., 1853; Brownson's Quart. (N. Y.), 1859, 1860. *Rosmini*, on Origin of Ideas, Moral Phil., Theodicy, Ontology, Theosophy, etc. Comp. Zeitschrift f. Philos., 1856, 1859 (by Seydel); Annales de Philos. Chrét., 1860; *Depit*, Histoire de la Phil. dans l'Italie, Paris, 1859; *Bartholméss*, Histoire critique des doctrines religieuses de la Phil. Moderne, 2 vols., Paris, 1855. Father *Lockhart*, Life of Rosmini, Lond., 1856. Rosmini's work, The Five Wounds of the Church (1. In left hand—separation between people and priesthood in public worship; 2. In right hand—inadequate instruction of priesthood; 3. In the side—discussion among bishops; 4. In right foot—lay nomination of bishops; 5. In left foot—dependence of ecclesiastical property)—written 1832, publ. 1844, was prohibited by the Congregation of Cardinals, 1845; but the accusation was dismissed as containing no heresy, after an examination of all Rosmini's writings, (30 vols.), under the Presidency of the Pope in General Congregation. Rosmini founded the Institute of Charity, on the Lago Maggiore, 1838.]

[2] Joseph II. (reigned from the year 1780) stood in the same relation to the Roman Catholic Church, in which Frederick II. stood to the Protestant Church, but manifested greater interest for religion, and was also more dictatorial. Concerning *Justinus Febronius* (Nicolas of Hontheim) and the Punctation of Ems (1786); and *Scipio Ricci*, Bishop of Pistoja and Prato under the reign of Leopold of Tuscany, see the works on ecclesiastical history. [*De Potter*, Vie de Ricci, 2 tom., 1825]. The contests about the hierarchy, celibacy, and monasticism also belong to church history, and not to the history of doctrines.

[3] *Isenbiehl* (1774) was violently attacked on account of his interpretation of the Messianic prophecies.—In later times the critical and exegetical labors of *Jahn*, *Hug*, and *Scholz*, were distinguished by a more liberal spirit of inquiry.—*Dereser* and *Van Ess* translated the sacred Scriptures into German; *Blau* (died 1798) undermined the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church (Frankf., 1791).—*Joseph Muth* examined the relation in which Christianity stands to the religion of reason (Hadamar, 1818). *Michl* (Anton) manifested more liberal views in the treatment of ecclesiastical history. [Among the German Roman Catholic divines, at the close of the last century, who tried to popularise theology, were *Gazzaniga*, Praelect. Theol., Vien., 1775; *Gervasio*, Tract. Theol., Vien., 1765: *Klüpfel*, Institut. Theol.,

indob., 1789; *Wiest*, Demonstratio dogm., Ingolstadt, 1788; *Stattler*, in his Theol. Christ. Theoret., Eustad., 1781, and Loci Theol., 1775, tried to introduce a more philosophical spirit. Under the influence of the later German philosophy, *Schwarz* made use of Kantian ideas; *Zimmer* applied Schelling's theory of intellectual intuition; *Dobmeyer* interspersed philosophical reflections; *Klee* tried to infuse into the whole system a philosophic method; *Liebermann* (Inst. Theol., ed. 7, Mogunt., 1853), has more the character of a positive dogmatics. See *Kuhn*, Kathol. Dogmatik, Bd. i. 2te. Aufl., p. 515. Kuhn's own work takes a high rank among the modern Roman Catholic systems, in the attempt to reconcile faith and reason; the second volume is on the Trinity.]

[4] *Wessenberg* and his school were characterized by an idealing tendency, and a spirit of toleration towards other communions. [*Von Wessenberg-Ampringen*, b. 1777, d. 1860; from 1817 to 1827, in the diocese of Constance, in conflict with Rome. He wrote on the German Church, 1816; the Great Councils of the 15th and 16th Cent., 4 vols., 1845; God and the World, 2 vols., 1857.] Comp. (*Keller*) Katholikon, für Alle unter jeder Form das Eine, Aarau., 1827. On the other hand, *Sailer* (1751–1832) in distinction from this more rationalising tendency, endeavored to represent Romanism in an attractive form, by the use of mystic phraseology; and, lastly, some others, such as *Martin Boos*, *Al. Henhöfer*, and *Johann Gossner*, sought to introduce the stricter evangelical principle (and Pietism) into the theology of the Roman Catholic Church; the two latter afterwards became converts to the Protestant faith, but not the first; see his autobiography, edited by Gossner, Leipz., 1826.—In opposition to these reforming tendencies, *Görres* (born 1776) endeavored to maintain the principles of the Romanism of the middle ages. His works, characterized by vigor and genius, gave new support to the school of Munich. [*Joseph Görres*, b. 1776, d. 1848. His History of Mysticism is a reproduction of the mediæval systems, adapted to modern times.]

[5] *George Hermes*, born 1775, was professor of theology in Münster and Bonn, and died 1831. By asserting that the Romish doctrine might be proved philosophically, he undermined the authority of the Church. See his Einleitung in die christkatholische Theologie, Münster, 1819, 31, Voll. ii., 1829. Christkatholische Dogmatik, herausgegeben von *Achterfeldt*, Münster, 1834, 3 voll. His theory was condemned by Pope Gregory XVI. (1835.) Comp. *P. J. Elvenich*, Acta Hermesiana, Gött., 1836. *Zell*, Acta antihermesiana, Sittard, 1836. *Braun* et *Elvenich*, Meletemata theologica, Lips., 1838; Acta Romana, Han., 1838. *Rheinwald*, Repertorium, xxxii.–xxxiv. The condemnation of Hermes was renewed by Pius IX. in 1847. [See *Niedner*, p. 828–30; and his Philosophiæ Hermesii Explicatio, 1838. Die Wahrheit in Hermes. Sache, Darmst., 1837. *Elvenich*, Der Hermesianismus und Joh. Perrone, 2te. Aufl., 1844. *Sudhoff* in Herzog's Realencyclop.]

[6] *Möhler* was born 1796, and died 1838. Having received his first impressions from the study of Protestant theology (Schleiermacher), he afterwards employed his knowledge to oppose it. By his Symbolism (Mainz, 1832), he revived the controversy between the Roman Catholics and Pro

testants, and induced the latter to re-examine their own principles. [Symbolism, transl. by J. R. Robertson, 2 vols., Lond., 1843; New York, 1844. For the works in reply, see vol. i. ante, p. 42. *P. Marheineke*, Ueber M.'s Symbolik, Berl., 1833.]—The most eminent theologians and philosophers of the Roman Catholic Church are: *Francis Baader* [d. in Munich, 1841: works edited by *F. Hoffmann*, 12 Bde., 1858. Comp. *Lütterbeck*, der philos. Standpunkt Baaders, 1854; *Hamberger*, Cardinalpunkte Baaderschen Phil., 1855; *Hoffmann*, Beleuchtung der neuesten Urtheile, 1854; *Erdmann* in Zeitschrift f. Philos., 1856; *Pelt*, in Reuter's Repert., Mai, 1860; *Hamberger*, Schelling und Baader in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol., 1860]; *F. A. Staudenmaier* [d. 1854] (among his numerous works we mention: Encyclopädie, 1834. Philosophie des Christenthumus, 1839. Metaphysik der heiligen Schrift, 1840); and *J. B. Hirscher* (he wrote: Ueber das Verhältness des Evangeliums zu der theologischen Scholastik der neuesten Zeit im katholischen Deutschland, Tub., 1823. Die Katholische Lehre vom Ablasse. ibid., 1829, etc.) [*Sengler*, Specul. Philos. und Theol., 1837; Die Idee Gottes, 2, 1852; *Denzinger*, Die religiose Erkenntniss, 2, 1857; *Oischinger*, Die neuere Phil., 1853; Glaubenslehre, 1858; *Von Lasaulx*, d. 1860, Phil. der Gesch., Aesthetik, etc.—The question on the relation of faith and reason is agitated anew between *Clemens* and *Kuhn*. See *Clemens*, De Scholasticorum Sententia, Philosophiam esse Theologiæ Ancillam, Comment.; against Kuhn's Dogmatik (1846); *Kuhn*, Philos. und Theologie, 1860, Glauben und Wissen nach St. Thomas in the Theol. Quartalschrift, 1860, and the 2d ed. of his Dogmatik; *Clemens*, Ueber d. Verhältniss der Philos. zur Theol., 1860.]

[7] *Günther*, Vorschule zur specul. Theol. Wien, 1828–1848. [*Günther* und Palst, Janusköpfe für Philos. und Theol. Wien, 1834.] Comp. *N. P. Oischinger*, Die Günthersche Philos., Schaffh., 1852. *Baltzer*, Neue theol. Briefe an Günther, Bresl., 1853. Die specul. Theologie Günthers und seine Schule (reprinted from Himmelsteins Kathol. Wochenschrift), Würzb., 1839. Zeitschrift f. lutherische Theol., xvi., 1854. *Hase* in Church History, p. 655. [Günther was condemned at Rome, 1857, for his teachings on the Trinity, Incarnation and Creation; and submitted.]

[8] The relation in which Zinzendorf stood to Jansenism is worthy of notice: "*Jansenism was the salt without which the Roman Catholic Church of that period* [beginning of the eighteenth century], *would have perished;*" *Tholuck*, Vermischte Schriften, ii. p. 33. Concerning the various modifications of Jansenism, see *Hase*, Church History, p. 516.

[9] The anti-ecclesiastical theories of Theophilanthropinism (1796–1802), and of St. Simonism (at a later period), [see Hase, 679] had only a temporary existence. Romanism was brought into connection with politics by *Chateaubriand* (born 1769) and *Lamennais*.—The rationalistic church of Abbé *Chatel* (1830, August.) [*Chateaubriand*, b. 1769, d. 1848; his Genius of Christianity was published in 1802, English version by *F. Shoberl*, 2 vols., 1811; new translation by *C. J. White*, Phil., 1856. *Bautain* has also published a Moral Philosophy, 1842, and Psychology. *De la Mennais*, d. 1854, his work on Indifference in Matters of Religion (1817–1823, 9th ed., 1851,) was an eloquent advocacy of Rome; but he abandoned the traditional faith

in his Affaires de Rome, and Esquisse d'une Philosophie, 1841–5. Count *Joseph de Maistre*, d. 1821, Defended the ultra-montane idea of the Papacy, and inveighed against the Baconian induction.—*Aug. Nicolas*, Etudes philosophiques, sur le Christianismus, 2 vols., 7th ed., 1854. The works of *A. Gratry* (De la Logique, de Dieu, Psychologie, 1855–8), revive the earlier French speculations.]

[10] *Bautain*, Philosophie du Christianisme, Strassb., 1835. *Rheinwald* Acta. histor. eccles., 1835, p. 305, ss., 1837, p. 68, ss. *F. Jünge*, in Illgens Zeitschrift für historische Theologie, 1837, vii. part 2. His system was condemned by the Pope, 1834, Dec. 20th. Comp. †*Kuhn*, uber Glauben und Wissen, in der theologischen Quartalschrift, 1839, part 3. [Traditionalism has been the prevailing tendency of French Catholicism, represented by *De Bonald*. *Bautain* and his Annales de la Philos. Chrétienne. The Roman See in 1856 took still more definite ground against the pure traditionalists in 4 Propositions, at the instance of Abp. *Sibour*. On this controversy, see Annales de la Philos. Chrét., 1859-60; Brownson's Quarterly Rev., 1860–1; *Lupus*, Le Traditionalisme et le Rationalisme, 3 Tom., Liège, 1860.

[11] History of the Holy Coat of Treves. See *Guericke*, *Hase*, p. 656; *Niedner*, p. 926. [*Gildemeyer* and *von Sybel*, Historisch. Untersuchung, 1844. John Ronge, or the Holy Coat of Treves, New York, 1845.]

[12] *John Ronge* [b. 1813], of Laurahütte, in Silesia. Letter to Bp. Arnoldi of Treves, Oct., 1844.—Council at Leipsic, March 23–26, 1845. His system given by *Niedner*, p. 927, note. [He denounced papacy and hierarchy, and claimed full freedom of conscience and of investigation; the statements of his faith are simply those of the Apostles' Creed. See *Sam. Laing*, Notes on Rise of German Catholic Church, 1845. *Gervinus*, Mission of German Cath., transl. Lond., 1846.]

[13] *John Czerski* of Schneidemühl (in Prussian Posen), Offenes Glaubensbekenntniss der Christl.-Apostol.-Kathol. Gemeinde, Stuttg., 1844.—*Czerski*, Sendschreiben an alle christl.-theol.-kathol. Gemeinden, June, 1845.—Berlin Protestant Church, May to August, 1845.—Meeting of Ronge, Theiner and Czerski, in Rawicz, Feb., 1846.—Synod in Schneidemühl, July, 1846, and final adoption there of the Confession of Faith. See *D. F. F. Kampe*, Das Wesen das Deutschkatholicismus, Tübing., 1850. See also (including the literature), *Niedner*, p. 926, *sq.*, and *Herzog's* Realencyclop. *Hase*, p. 657.

[14] [*Alban Butler*, b. 1710, d. 1773: Lives of Saints, 12 vols., 1847, New York, 1846; Meditations and Discourses, repr., 1840.—*Charles Butler*, b. 1750, d. 1832: Historical Memoirs of English, etc., Catholics, 4 vols., 3d ed., 1822; Confessions of Faith, 1816; Book of Rom. Cath. Church (against *Southey*), 1825, and Vindication, against *Townsend*, 1826; Horæ Biblicæ etc.—*John Milner*, b. 1752, d. 1836: End of Controversy, 2d ed., 1819 (reply by Jarvis in Am.); Vindication of the same, 1822.—*Jos. Berington*, b. 1743, d. 1827: Letter on Hartley (see § 285, *a*, note 15, above); State of English Catholics, 1780, 1787; Exposition of Rom. Cath. Principles, 1787; Rights of Dissenters, 1789; his Memoirs of Panzani's career in England (1634–7), transl. 1793, led to a controversy with Rev. *C. Plowden*, and to Berington's Faith of Catholics, 1813; Literary Hist. of Middle Ages,

1814, 1816. *Richard Challoner*, bp. of Debra, d. 1781, Britannia Sacra, 1740.—*John Lingard*, d. 1851: Hist. England, new ed., 10 vols., 1849; Antiq. of Anglo-Saxon Church, 2, 1848; Strictures on bp. Marsh's Comparison of Confessions, 1815; Transl. of Gospels, etc.—Cardinal *Nicholas Wiseman* (Abp. of Winchester, 1850) is the ablest of the English Catholics: Lectures on Doctrines, etc., of Church of Rome, 2, 1844; Real Presence, 1836; Science and Revealed Religion, 2d ed., 1842, reprinted in Andover; Essays, 3 vols., 1853, etc.—The following went from the Oxford School to the Catholic Church (comp. above, § 285, *a.*) *John Newman*, now head of the Catholic Univ., Dublin, Difficulty of Anglicans, 1850; Position of Catholics, 1851; University Education, etc. *W. G. Ward*, Ideal of Church, 1844; Anglican Establishment, 1850, contrasted with Church Catholics; Nature and Grace, 1860. *Henry E. Manning*, Unity of Church, 1852; Sermons; Grounds of Faith, 1852. *Henry W. Wilberforce*, Baptism, 2d ed., 1849; Incarnation, 3d ed., 1850; the Eucharist, 1853. The *Dublin Review*, since 1855, has been the ablest organ of the English Roman Catholics.]

[16] [Bp. *John England* (S. C.), d. 1842: Works, 5 vols., 1849. Prince *Gallitzin*, d. 1840: Defence of Catholic Principles. Abp. *John Hughes* of New York, controversial pamphlets. Abp. *F. P. Kenrick*, b. 1797: Theol. dogmatica, 2 vols., 1840 (repr. in Antwerp); Theologia Moralis, 3, 1842; the Primacy, 1837; Justification, 1841, Reply to bp. Hopkins, etc.—Bp. *Spalding* (of Kentucky), on the Reformation (against Merle d'Aubigné); Miscellanies; Evidences. *O. A. Brownson*, Society and Church, 1836; Essays on Church Questions, 1852; ed. Brownson's Quarterly, which has been Catholic since 1844.]

§ 288.

THE RUSSIAN-GREEK CHURCH.

[*A. N. Monravieff*, Hist. of Church of Russia, 1838, transl. by *Blackmore*, Oxf., 1842. *R. W. Blackmore*, Doctrine of the Russian Church, from Sclavonic and Russ. originals, Aberdeen, 1845. *Macaire*, Theologie dogmatique orthodoxe, trad. par un Russe, 2 vols., Paris, 1860. Introduction à la Theol. orthodoxe de Macaire (rector of Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg, translated by *Michael Bulgakoff*; see Christ. Rembr., Jan., 1858), Paris, 1857. Catechisme detaillé de l'Eglise catholique orientale, trad. du Russe, Paris, 1852. *W. Palmer*, Dissertations on the Eastern Catholic Communion, Lond., 1852. Prince *August. Galitzin*, l'Eglise greco-russe, Paris, 1861. *Waddington's* Greek Church, 1854. *Gass* in Herzog's Realencyclop. Glaubenszeugnisse der griechischen Kirche, in Appendix to *Hase*, Dogmatik, 5te. Aufl., 1860. *A. P. Stanley*, Lectures on the Eastern Church, 1861, Lectures 4 to 8 on Russia.]

In the Russian-Greek Church *Theophanes Procopowicz*[1] and *Platon*[2] set forth the orthodox doctrines which were afterwards defended by the Imperial Counsellor, *Alexander of Stourdza*,[3] against the attacks of the Jesuits. But none of these exerted any influence upon the development of the doctrines of Christianity in general.

[1] *Prokopowicz* was born at Kiew, A. D., 1681, died 1739, as archbishop of Novgorod. After his death was published his: Christiana Orthod. Theolog. Tom. i.–vii. 1773–76, ss. See *Schröckh*, Kirchengeschichte (as continued by *Tzschirner*), ix. p. 207, ss.

[2] *Platon*, born 1737, became archbishop of Moscow [1775], and died 1812. He wrote: Rechtgläubige Lehre, oder Kurzer Auszug der christlichen Theologie, zum Gebrauch Seiner Königlichen Hoheit des Grossfürsten Paul Petrowisch, Riga, 1770 (translated into German.) Comp. Schröckh, l. c. p. 212, ss. *Schlegel*, Kirchengeschichte des 18ten Jahrhunderts, vol. p. 59, ss. [English translations of Platon by *Pinkerton*, viz., The Present State of the Greek Church in Russia, or Summary of Christian Divinity, Lond., 1814; another translation by *Coray*, The Orthodox Doctrine of Apostolic Eastern Church, etc., 1857; by *Potessaco*, Lond., 1858.]

[3] Considérations sur la doctrine de l'esprit de l'église orthodoxe, Stuttg 1816. Translated into German, 1817 (by *Kotzebue*.)

Concerning the sects of the Greek Church, the Nestorians, Monophysites, and Monothelites (Maronites), as well as those who dissented from the Russian Church (from the year 1666), viz. the Staroverzi (Rascolniks), and the Duchoborzi (the Russian Quakers), comp. the works on ecclesiastical history. *Hase*, p. 667. Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift. 1842, No. 19. *Hefele*, Die russische Kirche, in Tübing. Quartalschrift, 1853. [The Malakans—eating milk on fast-days, have become widely diffused during the present century. See Le Raskol (means dissent); Essai historique et critique sur les Sectes religieuses de la Russe Paris, 1854. Russian Schismatics, in Revue des deux Mondes, 1859.]

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FIFTH PERIOD.

FIRST DIVISION.

PROLEGOMENA. RELIGION. REVELATION. BIBLE AND TRADITION.

(MIRACLE AND PROPHECY.)

§ 289.

RELIGION.

After Christianity, from the time of Wolf, had ceased to be regarded as the only religion, and a distinction had been made between natural and revealed religion, it became necessary to define the latter more precisely. For a considerable time both rationalists and supernaturalists adopted the definition: *Religio est modus Deum cognoscendi et colendi*,[1] with this difference, that the former made religion to consist chiefly in morality.[2] *Semler* made a distinction between religion and theology,[3] and *Herder* separated religion from doctrinal opinions and religious usages.[4] According to *Schleiermacher*, religion consists neither in knowledge, nor in action, but is a certain definite tendency of the soul, manifesting itself as the absolute feeling of dependence on God.[5] Most of the modern mediating theologians rest their systems on the same principle.[6] The adherents of speculative philosophy consider knowledge as the foundation;[7] the practical systems appeal to *conscience*, in the last instance.[8]

[1] On this point comp. *Twesten*, Dogmatik, i., p. 2, and *Nitzsch*, System § 6. The formula is somewhat enlarged by *Ammon*, Summ. Theol. Chr. § 1: Conscientiæ vinculum, quo cogitando, volendo et agendo numini nos obstrictos sentimus.

[2] According to *Kant*, religion consists in this, that in reference to al our duties we consider God the legislator who is to be reverenced by all. See his Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, p. 139.

[3] Semler too confounded religion with ethics (the reformation of the life). See *Tholuck*, ii., p. 111.

[4] In his treatise: Von Religion, Lehrmeinungen und Gebräuchen, 1798. (Works, xviii., p. 169–330.)

[5] Christliche Glaubenslehre, § 3 ss., comp. his Reden über die Religion, p. 56–77. [On Schleiermacher's and kindred views, see *Morell's* Philosophy of Religion (1849), pp. 82–106; *Thornwell* in Southern Presb. Rev., April, 1856. *Miles*, Philosophic Theology (1849), 175, sq. *G. Wissenborn*, Vorlesungen über Schleiermacher's Dogmatik (1847), p. 31–65.]

[6] This definition was adopted by *Twesten* and *Nitzsch*, l. c. and, with some modifications by *Hase*, § 2–6, and *De Wette*, Vorlesungen über die Religion, Vorles. 4. *Wegscheider* (Inst. § 2.) defines religion as æquabilis et constans *animi affectio*, etc. That this theory does not necessarily exclude knowledge, may be seen from the passages of the respective writers above referred to. Comp. also *Elvert*, über das Wesen der Religion, Tübinger Zeitschrift, 1835, part 3. *Ch. Weisse*, in his Philosophische Dogmatik, oder Phil. des Christenthums (ii. Leipz., 1855–60), comprises religion under the generic idea of *Experience* (*Erfahrung*), § 22–103. See also, *S. A. Carlblom*, Das Gefühl in seiner Bedeutung für den Glauben, Berlin, 1857. [*Lechler*, Idea of Religion, in Studien und Kritiken, 1851, translated by *W. Stearns*, Bib. Sacra, 1852. *Hase*, defines it as "a striving after the absolute, in itself unattainable; but by love to it, man becomes a partaker of the divine perfection." *Nitzsch*, § 7: "an active and passive relation of the finite consciousness to the Creator, Preserver, and Ruler of the World."]

[7] See Hegel's Preface to Hinrichs Religionsphilosophie. According to *Hegel* and *Vatke*, religion is the *process of the mind*. (*Nitzsch*, System, p. 9). Feuerbach insists upon the subjective element as making the essence of religion, and then finds in this the evidences that it rests upon self-deception; theology is only anthropology, God is only a reflex of man. See his Wesen des Christenthums, p. 20: "Religion is a relation of man to himself, or, more correctly to his own nature (his subjective nature), but a relation to his own nature as if it were another nature." In reply see *Zeller*, Ueber das Wesen der Religion, in his Theolog. Jahrbücher, 1845, p. 26, sq., 393 sq., *Biederman*, Die freie Theologie, Tüb., 1844, pp. 31–45. [Comp. *Marian Evans's* translation of Feuerbach's Essence of Christianity, p. 32 sq.: "Consciousness of God is self-consciousness, knowledge of God is self knowledge." He urges the position, conceded by some theologians, that the divine attributes have only a subjective sense and value; what is admitted of the attributes or predicates, he says, must also hold good of the subject of these predicates: "That which has no predicates or qualities, has no effect upon me; that which has no effect upon me has no existence for me. To deny the qualities is to deny the being."]

[8] *J. T. Beck*, Christliche Lehrwissenschaft, i. 230 sq. *Ebrard*, i., p. 11. See also *J. P. Lange*, i. 185. [*Ebrard*, "Religion is the elevation of sensibility, will and feeling into a higher and immediate unity of the God-con-

sciousness; or the indivisible unity of blessedness, holiness and wisdom." *Lange* says there is a threefold relation to God; first, man recognizes God as the all-determining spirit, and his dependence upon him: second, gives himself to God, as a being of absolute power, goodness and love, and in doing this attains the pure determination of his own nature: third, in this union with God he receives the true life of his own soul, etc. *Schenkel* in his Dogmatik vom Standpunkte des Gewissens, 1858, i. 135–155, makes conscience to be the organ of religion in man. *Rothe*, Ethik, i. 264, views conscience as essentially religious; "conscience stands or falls with the idea of God."]

§ 290.

TRUTH AND DIVINE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY. PERFECTIBILITY. REASON AND REVELATION.

Notwithstanding their many differences of opinion, all Christians agreed in believing, that of all historical forms of religion, Christianity was most worthy of God, and best adapted to the religious wants of mankind. The rationalists, however, had recourse to the suppositions, either, that the historical religion, serves as a mere vehicle for the natural, and will at some time be resolved into it,[1] or, that it will gradually lose its present local and temporary character, and be perfected after the ideal formed by reason.[2] On the other hand the supernaturalists of course regarded the religion revealed in Holy Writ as complete in itself for all times. As regards the nature of revelation, and its relation to reason, the supernaturalists belonging to the earlier part of the present period conceded important rights to the latter.[3] Asserting that revelation was, more properly speaking, the complement of reason, they assigned to the latter (now becoming conscious of its limits) the office of proving the possibility and necessity of revelation.[4] But after *Kant* had combated the idea that reason was competent to decide what was *revealed* or not, the rationalists substituted the idea of positive (historical) religion for that of revealed religion, and maintained that the moral value of the former was to be determined by practical reason.[5] In opposition to both these systems, others assigned a more comprehensive meaning to the idea of *revelation.*[6] In the opinion of some speculative philosophers, it is not so much the communication of isolated and abstract ideas, as the intellectual intuition of the universal, which constitutes the essence of revelation.[7] According to others, (practical theologians), revelation is rather the manifestation of the divine power, which, however, does not exclude the cognitive faculties of man, though it puts them in a secondary place.[8] At any rate the idea of revelation is now taken in a more living and flowing

sense than it was in the older theology, notwithstanding all the differences of present usage.

[1] *Henke*, Lineam. i. 2: Quo magis adolescunt homines....eo minus ponderis apud illos habet....auctoritas aliorum. Hinc et omnis revelata religio paullatim in rationalem transit, et eo eniti potest homo, ut alienæ institutioni non amplius fontis, sed canalis, non lucis, sed lucernæ (!) beneficium tribuat.

[2] *Lessing* suggested the idea of a perfectibility of the Christian religion, in his (?) treatise: Ueber Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts. The views of *Semler* respecting the local and temporary in Christianity, and the distinction which he made between public and private religion, seem to indicate that he held the same opinion. The same may be said in reference to the work of *Teller:* Religion der Vollkommen. Comp. *W. T. Krug*, Briefe über die Perfectibilität der geoffenbarten Religion, Jena u. Lpz., 1795, and *Ch. F. Ammon*, Die Fortbildung des Christenthums zur Weltreligion, Lpz., 1833–35, ii.; 2d ed., 1836–40, iv.

[3] In opposition to the Socinians, who (in strict accordance with supernaturalism) rejected the idea of natural religion, as well as to the "Fanaticos, qui dicunt, rationem esse cæcam, corruptam, hominem a Deo magis abducere, quam ad Deum adducere," the adherents of the old orthodoxy defended the use of reason in matters of religion, *e. g.*, *Beck*, in his Fundamenta, p. 35, ss. *J. L. Frey* (professor of theology in Basle, died 1759), De officio Doctoris Christiani, pp. 33, 34: Cum enim lumen naturæ æque ac revelationis Deum patrem luminum auctorem agnoscat, nihil a Deo naturæ lumini repugnans revelari censendum est, nisi Deum sibi ipsi adversari blaspheme statuere in animum inducamus. Imo ne ipsius quidem revelationis divinitas credi posset, si quidquam rationis lumini repugnans in illa inveniretur. Comp. *Baumgarten*, Glaubenslehre, Einleitung.—The distinction made between articuli puri et mixti.—Advocates of modern evangelical supernaturalism have again maintained, that reason is altogether blind in matters of religion (in opposition to rationalism). [Comp. the Mansel and Maurice discussion, § 285, *b*, note.]

[4] Comp. *Bretschneider*, Entwicklung, etc. (new edit., 1841), § 30, and the compendiums of dogmatic theology.

[5] See *Fichte*, Kritik, etc. *Tieftrunk*, Censur, p. 66, ss., p. 245, ss.

[6] According to *Herder*, the general meaning of revelation is disclosure, publication, enlightening, clear idea, perception, conviction. See the passages collected in Herder's Dogmatik, p. 20, ss.

[7] In the opinion of *Schelling* (Methode, p. 196), the whole of history is a divine revelation. According to *Blasche* (Philosophie der Offenbarung), revelation is equal to manifestation (§ 5.) Not only history, but also natural history, belongs to the province of divine revelation (§ 22.) He combats the common (supernaturalistic) view, according to which revelation is supernatural, § 43, ss. Revelation is opposed to mystery, and signifies the disclosures of mysteries, while, according to the common view, revelation itself contains mysteries, § 55, ss.

[8] *Twesten*, § 24 (vol. i. p. 349), defines revelation as the "manifestation

of divine grace for the salvation of mankind." Comp. the whole section, and *Nitzsch*, § 23, ss. *De Wette* shows the necessity of making a distinction between revelation and the inspiration of Holy Writ, Dogmatik, § 26. On the difficulty of establishing precise definitions, see *Schleiermacher*, § 10. Among the recent divines, see *J. P. Lange*, i. 385, *sq.* *Martensen* (ed. of 1836), p. 49, *sq.* *Ch. Weisse*, § 104–179. On *Hermes* and *Bautain* in the Catholic church, see § 287. [Comp. *H. Ulrici*, Glauben und Wissen, Speculation und exacte Wissenschaft, Lpz., 1858.—*H. Rogers*, (Edinb. Rev., 1849), on Faith and Reason, repr. in his Essays; and his Eclipse of Faith, 1852.—*Fronde's* Nemesis of Faith, Lond., 1849. *Morell's* Phil. of Religion. *F. W. Newman*, Phases of Faith, 1850. Brownson's Qu. Rev., July, 1856. Bibliotheca Sacra, vi., on the Relations of Faith and Philosophy. Christ. Examiner, March, 1861: The Cause of Reason and the Cause of Faith (*Hedge*).—The controversy between Traditionalism and Rationalism in the Rom. Cath. Church, led to the publication of four propositions by the Holy See, on Reason and Faith, Dec. 12, 1855. The first asserts, that though faith be above reason, yet there is no dissension, for both are from one fountain of light, viz., God. 2. Ratiocinatio Dei existentiam, animæ spiritualitatem, hominis libertatem cum certitudine probare potest. Fides posterior est revelatione; proinde ad probandum Dei existentiam contra atheum, ad probandum animæ rationalis spiritualitatem, ac libertatem contra naturalismi, ac fatalismi sectatorem allegari convenienter nequit. 3. Rationis usus fidem præcedit, et ad eam hominem ope revelationis et gratiæ conducit. The fourth proposition asserts, that the method of Bonaventura and others does not lead to rationalism. See Brownson's Qu. Rev., 1860, p. 440, *sq.*]

§ 291.

THE WORD OF GOD. SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION. SCRIPTURE AND SPIRIT.

During the preceding period Protestant theologians had been accustomed to call the sacred Scriptures themselves the Word of God; in the course of the present period the distinction was enforced between *the Word of God contained in Holy Writ* and the Scriptures themselves.[1] The rationalists themselves, however, retained the (negative) principle of Protestantism, that the sacred Scriptures are a purer source of knowledge than tradition.[2] Only *Lessing* advanced the opinion that tradition is older than Holy Writ.[3] Some modern theologians endeavored to determine precisely the relation in which these two stand to each other, and showed that their difference is more relative than absolute.[4] *Puseyism* made the attempt to enforce the authority of tradition in the old Catholic sense.[5] By the *Protestant Friends* [§ 284, note 2] the question: Scripture, or

Spirit? was decided in a sense which gave the most unlicensed play to subjective opinions.[6]

[1] There were hints of this even in the century of the Reformation; see *Schenkel*, i. § 13. The distinction was first made prominent by *J. G. Töllner* (died 1774): Der Unterschied der heiligen Schrift und des Wortes Gottes, in his Miscellaneous Essays, Frankf., 1766, p. 85, ss. He shows, from the language of Scripture itself, that, by the *Word of God*, we are not to understand the Sacred Scriptures; on the other hand there are some things in Holy Writ which do not belong to the Word of God (such as historical events) although all in it has respect to the Word of God; and, in connection with it, that not all parts of Holy Writ are equally rich in the Word of God. Töllner goes even as far as to maintain that the Word of God is not limited to the sacred Scriptures, but also exists elsewhere; for he who propounds divine truth, propounds the Word of God. It is further contained in reason, and may be found in all the different forms of religion known among mankind, though Christians possess the Word of God in its most excellent, most perfect, and clearest form in the sacred Scriptures.—*Herder* directed the attention of theologians to what may be called the *human* aspect of Scripture (Briefe über das Studium der Theologie, Brief. i., and in his Spirit of Hebrew Poetry [see *Marsh's* version]; in his essay, Vom Geist des Christenthums, and in other works.

[2] The rationalists often ventured to maintain that their system alone was in *accordance with Scripture*, and rejected the development of doctrines, and the symbolical definitions, as contrary to the principle of Protestantism.

[3] *Lessing*, in his controversy with Götze, appealed to the Regula Fidei in its earliest sense, which existed previous to the written Word. Comp. his works, vi., vii.; Theologischer Nachlass, p. 115 ss. *Delbrück* revived this idea in his work: Philip Melancthon, der Glaubenslehrer, Bonn, 1826. He was opposed by *Sack*, *Nitzsch*, and *Lücke*, Bonn, 1827.

[4] *Pelt*, in the first part of the Theologische Mitarbeiter, Kiel, 1830. *Schenkel*, über das ursprüngliche Verhältniss der Kirche zum Kanon, Basel, 1838. Compare with this work the modern compendiums of dogmatic theology, *e. g. Twesten*, i., p. 115–119, 128–130, 288. *Marheineke*, Symbolik, ii., p. 187 ss. The critical researches respecting the origin of the Canon (from the time of Semler), rendered the distinction between Scripture and tradition more indefinite. [Comp. *Holtzmann*, Kanon und Tradition, 427 sq.]

[5] See *Keble* on Primitive Tradition, (compare the German work of *Weaver-Amthor*, ubi supra, p. 10 sq., 40 sq.) The tradition of the first six centuries was assumed as untroubled. Among the German theologians *Daniel* in his "Kontroversen," Halle, 1843, approximates most closely to the Oxford school: in reply, see *Jacobi*, Die Kirchliche Lehre von der Tradition und heiliger Schrift, Berl., 1847. [On the Oxford view, see *W. Goode*, Div. Rule of Faith, 2d ed., 3, 1843; Palmer on the Church, ii. 11–93: *E. B. Pusey*, The Rule of Faith: *Peck*, Appeal from Tradition to Scripture, New York, 1844, Tracts for the Times, 78.]

[6] *Wislicenus*, Ob Schrift, ob Geist? 2 Aufl., 1845, and the writings in this controversy (Comp. *Bruns* und *Hüfner's* Repert., vi., etc.).—*Scherer* in

several articles in the Rev. de Theol. (see § 285, note 11). *Tholuck* in the Zeitschrift f. Christl. Wissenschaft, 1850, No. 16–18, 42–44. In reply, *Stier* in the same journal, 1850, No. 21. [Tholuck's Essay translated in Journal of Sacred Lit., July, 1854; his reply to *Stier* in Zeitschrift f. Christl. Wiss., 1851.—*Scherer* first wrote La Critique et la Foi, 1850; replied to *Malan* in Rev. de Theol., 1850; to *Merle d'Aubigne*, *Gasparin*, *Chenevière* (De l'Autorité du Nouveau Test.), and others, 1850–1. *Gasparin*, reviewed Scherer in Les Archives du Christ., 1850; his work on Plenary Inspiration, transl. by *Jas. Montgomery*, 1851. On this controversy, see *Schaff's* Kirchenfreund, Aug., 1851; Princeton Review, July, 1851.]

§ 292.

Inspiration of Scripture. Interpretation. Miracles and Prophecy.

The critical treatment of the sacred Scriptures gradually undermined the authority of the former rigid theory of inspiration.[1] For a time commentators sought to remove all difficulties by the application of the principle of accommodation,[2] or by an arbitrary exegesis;[3] but at last the rationalists found themselves compelled by a more unbiassed system of interpretation to acknowledge that Christ and his apostles might have erred, at least in those things which do not constitute the essential parts of religion. This was the case especially with the miracles and prophecies, to which the former apologists had appealed in support of their views. After they had in vain endeavored to explain them away by artificial modes of interpretation, they were compelled to assert that the sacred writers had a different point of view from that of modern theologians; thus renouncing the absolute authority of their writings.[4] The adherents of the mediating theology sought to avoid these difficulties, by affixing to the idea of *inspiration*,[5] as well as to that of *miracle*[6] and of *prophecy*,[7] a more comprehensive and spiritual sense. But at the same time they introduced much that was indefinite, which is not yet fully cleared up.

[1] The theory of accommodation was principally applied to the demoniacal and miraculous; Christ and his apostles accommodated themselves to the weakness and the prejudices of their contemporaries. Comp. *Senf*, Versuch über die Herablassung Gottes in der christlichen Religion, Halle, 1792. *P. van Hemmert*, über die Accommodation im N. Test. translated from the Dutch, Dortm. u. Lpz., 1797. *Vogel*, Aufsätze theologischen Inhalts, Nürnb., 1799. 2d part; and several others. This theory was combated by *Süsskind* über die Grenzen der Pflicht, keine Unwarheit zu sagen, im Magazin St. 13. *Heringa*, über die Lehre Jesu und seiner Apostel, translated from the Dutch, Offenb. 1792. For more particulars as to the literature, comp. *Bretschneider*, Entwickl., p. 138 ss. [*Hugh Farmer*, b. 1714, d. 1787, maintained that

the demoniacs were simply affected by disease, Essay on Demoniacs, 1775; Letters to Dr. Worthington, 1778; Worship of Human Spirits in the Ancient Nations, 1783. *John Fell* (d. 1791), also replied to Farmer. Farmer's views had been previously in part maintained by *Dr. Mead*, *Jos. Mede*, *Lardner* and *Sykes*.]

[2] The Rationalists are sometimes unjustly blamed, as if they alone had made use of that arbitrary mode of interpretation (explaining Christ's miracles as natural events, by *Paulus* and others). There were also supernaturalistic theologians, as *Storr*, who, had recourse to a most artificial exegesis, in order to remove differences in the various accounts of one and the same event, etc., which appeared contrary to the theory of verbal inspiration. (For example to take ἵνα as ἐκβατικῶς, in the appeal to Messianic passages, which are not strictly such.—*Kant* introduced the system of moral interpretation [*Davidson*, Sacred Hermeneutic, p. 193 ss.], according to which preachers and schoolmasters ought to explain Scripture, untroubled by its original historical meaning, in such a manner as is likely to prove useful to the moral condition of the people; and also to put such useful matter into passages which do not contain it; See his Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, p. 149 ss. His theory was opposed by *Rosenmüller* (Erlangen, 1794, 8.) In addition to the grammatico-historical system of interpretation which has been adopted by most modern commentators, *Germar* made use of the panharmonic, *Olshausen* and *Stier* of the allegorical, mode of interpretation.

[3] *Henke*, Lineamenta, c. 15. *Wegscheider*, Institutiones, § 44. *Tzschirner*, Dogmatik, c. ii., § 6. Different from this is the hypothesis, so much favored in recent times, on the alleged tendencies and aims of the biblical (particularly the New Testament) writers, as carried out in all its modulations especially by the school of Tübingen. See in opposition *Weisse*, Phil. Dogmatik, p. 151.

[4] Supernaturalists also admitted that the sacred penmen in writing concerning things not essential (*i. e.* not referring to religion), represented them according to their best knowledge and ability: see *Reinhard*, Dogmatik, p. 59 (56); *Storr*, Dogmatik, § 11. In the same way the adherents of modern theology agree with the rationalists in opposing the theory of verbal inspiration. This was the case especially with *Herder*, who on the other hand, expressed himself with enthusiasm in favor of that which is truly inspired; comp. his Essays, Vom Geist des Christenthums, Von der Gabe der Sprachen, etc. (Dogmatik, p. 91 ss.); *Tweston*, i., pp. 414, 415. Rationalism not only gave up the unconditional authority of the Scriptures, but also the belief that the Scriptures have normal authority in respect to *religious truth*; the mediating theology upheld their authority in this later aspect, by regarding the New Testament writings as the primitive productions of the Holy Spirit under the Christian dispensation, to which all later works stand in the same relation in which copies stand to the original. Comp. *Schleiermacher*, Christlicher Glaube, ii., p. 340 ss. According to *De Wette*, Dogmatik, p. 40, the essential part of interpretation is: "the religious sense of the divine working, or of the Holy Spirit in the sacred writers, solely in regard to their belief and elevation of soul, not having respect to the formation of their ideas," etc.

Comp. *Hase*, § 455 ss. *Billroth*, who belonged to the speculative school expressed himself as follows (Preface to his Commentary on the Corinthians, p. vii.): "It is the object of systematic theology, to comprehend that which is truly *rational*, even the *Spirit* which manifests itself in the Christian religion. But since this Spirit has assumed a *temporal form* in the revelation of God, it was of course received by men whose education was influenced by the peculiar circumstances of their age. These men were, in the first instance, the apostles," etc. Comp. *Marheineke*, Dogmatik, p. 358 ss.—Whoever with *Strauss* (Glaubenslehre, i. 179, note), looks upon such a recurrence to the first times of Christianity, as a sinking back into the unspiritual, will of course see in this the end of the history of the dogma of inspiration. Comp. *Schelling*, Methode des akad Studiums, p. 198. [Schelling here speaks of those who would thus reduce Christianity to its first, simple elements, and adds: "One might think that the teachers of the Christian religion would be thankful to those in later times, who have derived so much speculative material from the scanty contents of the first religious writings, and shaped them into a system." *Hegel*, Phil. d. Relig., iii. 111: "The biblical text contains the mode in which Christianity first appeared, this it describes: yet this cannot give us in an explicit form what is latent in the principle of Christianity, but only a presentiment thereof:" cited by *Strauss*, u. s. For a review and criticism of the whole subject in its present aspects and bearings in German theology, see *Rothe*, Zur Dogmatik, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1858, on Revelation and Inspiration. Comp. also *Köster*, Das Verhältniss der freien Thätigkeit zur göttlichen Offenbarung, in the Stud. und Krit., 1852; *Richm*, Der gottmensliche Character d. heiligen Schrift, ibid., 1859. *Philippi*, Glaubensl. i. 184, defends "word-inspiration," not inspiration of words.] The French orthodoxy has as yet adhered more strictly than the German to the theory of verbal inspiration. *Gasparin* and *Gaussen* are its chief representatives. [*Gasparin*, Plenary Insp., transl. by *Montgomery*; *Gaussen*, Theopneustia, transl. by *Kirk*.] In opposition thereto in recent times we find not only the rationalistic tendency of *Scherer* and the *Revue Protestante* [see § 29, note 6], but also more liberal views from the camp of the "believers." Comp. *Fréd. de Rougemont*, Christ et ses Témoins, Paris, 1856, 2 Tom. Thus in Tom. i., p. 426: La Révélation de Jésus Christ qui est la vie, et dont l'Esprit vit dans l'Eglise, ne suppose point nécessairement un document écrit. ii., p. 161: On détruit la Révélation quand on la transforme en un système de vérités abstraites.... Voulons-nous nous faire une idée d'une religion d'abstractions: prenons le Koran." Yet still he teaches the strictest subordination of reason to *revelation*, which he distinguishes from inspiration.

[In the English and American theology, the strict theory of verbal inspiration is defended by *John Dick*, Essay on Inspiration, 4th ed., Glasg., 1840; *Alexander Carson* (against *Pye Smith*); *Jas. A. Haldane*, 1845; *Eleazar Lord*, Plenary Insp., New York, 1857; *L. Woods*, Lectures on Theology, vol. 1. See also *E. Henderson*, on Divine Insp. (in Congregational Lects., vol. 4); *R. S. Candlish*, Authority and Insp. of Script., 1851; *Chr. Wordsworth*, on Insp., 2d ed., 1851, and Lectures in Westminster Abbey, 1861. *Coleridge*, in his Confession of an Inquiring Spirit, 1831, opposed the verbal

accuracy of the Scriptures. *Morell*, in his Philos. of Religion, restricted inspiration to intuitional truth (comp. *Thornwell*, in South. Presb. Quart., April, 1856).—*F. W. Newman*, *Gregg*, and *Theod. Parker*, indentify inspiration with the elevation of the soul by spiritual truth. *J. Macnaught*, The Doctrine of Inspiration, opposes the infallibility of the Scriptural record. Comp. on these later views the North British, Nov., '52, Aug., '57; British Quart., Jan., '57; Kitto's Journal, Oct., '53, Oct., '54, July, '56; Princeton Rev., '51, '57; Church Rev., '56; Church Eng. Quart., '54; *Fitch* in Bib. Sacra, '55; *Torrey* in Bib. Sac., '58; *Ellis* in Christ. Exam. (Unit.), Sept., '56; Lord *A. Hervey*, Sermons, Univ. Cambr., '56; *Heurtley*, Lect. Univ. Oxf., '61; *B. F. Westcott*, Introd. to Gospels, '60, pp. 5–37, 383, *sq.*—See also *Robt. Whytehead*, Warrant of Faith, Lond., '54; and especially *William Lee*, The Insp. of Holy Scripture, its Nature and Proof (Lects. before Univ. of Dublin), 1854, reprinted New York, 1856.]

[5] From the time of Spinoza (Tract. Theol. polit. c. 6, De Miraculis) and Hume, the rationalists did not cease to oppose the reality and credibility of miracles, while the adherents of the modern (formal) supernaturalism rested belief in revelation especially on that branch of evidence; in this they differed, *e. g.*, from Luther, comp. *Hase*, Dogmatik, p. 207. The theory of preformation advanced by *Bonnet* (according to which God has a priori included the miricles in the course of nature), did not meet with general approbation, see his "philosophische Untersuchungen," etc., edited by *Lavater*, Zürich, 1768. [See *Duc de Caraman*, Chs. Bonnet, Philosophe et Naturaliste, Paris, 1859.] The modern theory of *Olshausen*, who regards the miracles as a quickening of the processes of nature, bears some resemblance to the preceding. *Lavater* believed that miracles are still taking place. According to the philosophy of Kant, it is neither possible absolutely to prove the *reality* of miracles, nor can their *possibility* be absolutely denied (a difference is made between logical, physical, and moral possibility); see *Tieftrunk*, p. 245, ss. (*Kant*, Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, p. 107, ss.) The rationalists endeavored to explain the miraculous as something natural, while the natural philosophers asserted that nature transfigured by spirit (the blending of the two in one) is the only true miracle. But thus the reality of the miracle (in the Scriptural sense) was destroyed, and it was regarded as the symbolical expression of a speculative idea. See *Schelling*, Methode, p. 181, 203, and comp. *Bockshammer* and *Rosenkranz*, cited in *Strauss*, Dogmatik, p. 244, ss. [*Bockshammer* (Freiheit der Willens, transl. by *Kaufman*, Andov., 1840) says, that what is willed in the spirit of truth and purity with a mighty will, is willed in the Spirit of God, and it is only a postulate of reason, that nature cannot withstand such a will. Hence Christ is the great miracle-worker. *Rosenkranz* (Encycl. d. Theol. p. 160), defines miracle, as nature determined by spirit; spirit is the basis of nature, and hence nature cannot limit it. This power was fully concentrated in Christ.] The *natural* interpretation of miracles rather served the purposes of rationalism, while the adherents of modern speculative philosophy gave the preference to the hypothesis that the miracles related in Scripture are myths, because it is more agreeable to the negative tendency of that school. This hypothesis was most fully developed by

Strauss, in his Leben Jesu. [*Strauss's* Life of Jesus, transl., 3 vols., 1836; reprint. N. Y., one vol.—See in reply *Mill's* Christ. Advocate Publications, 1841–44; *Norton's* Genuineness of Gospels, '55; *Alexander's* Christ and Christianity; Christ. Rev., July, 1856; Brit. Quart., 5; For. Qu., 22; Bibl. Sacra, 2, 8; North American, July, 1860. *J. R. Beard*, Voices of the Church, in Reply to Strauss, Lond., 1845.] The adherents of the mediating theology used a more liberal, but also considerate and cautious mode of reasoning, in defending the credibility of the historical relations of the sacred writers. But some of them, *e. g. De Wette* and *Schleiermacher*, also admit mythical elements. As regards the idea of miracle itself, they make a distinction between the objective and the subjective, and, generally speaking, adopt the principle of Augustine, who did not regard a miracle as something absolutely supernatural (comp. Vol. i., § 118, note 1.) See *Schleiermacher*, i. p. 120; *De Wette*, p. 34; *Twesten*, i. p. 357, ss., and *Nitzsch*, p. 64, are more inclined to admit real miracles. [Also *Julius Müller*, see his De Miraculorum Jes. Christ. Natura et Necessitate, 1839.] The literature is more fully given by *Bretschneider*, Entwurf, p. 235, ss. Comp. also the views of *Herder* on this point, Dogmatik, p. 60, the poetical view of miracles.—A new construction of the idea of miracles in *Weisse*, Phil. Dogmatik, § 119–127. [He says, that the general notion of miracle comprises all the acts by which God revealed himself to his people, and guided their destinies; the giving the law was the great miracle under the Old Testament. He admits, however, that there are mythical elements in the history. See also *Lange's* Dogmatik, i., and *Schenkel*, i.—*Wardlaw*, on Miracles (1852, N. Y., 1853), and *Trench*, take different views as to the relation of miracle and doctrine: according to the former the miracle proves the doctrine; the latter is inclined to the converse position. (Comp. Journal Sac. Lit., April, '54; *Thornwell*, in South. Presb. Rev., 1856, and South. Qu. Rev., July, 1857; Princeton Rev., Oct., '53, April, '56.)—*Alexander* in his Christ of Christianity, classifies the definitions of miracle. On the general questions, see L. Woods, Works, vol. iv.; *N. W. Taylor*, Lects. on Theology, 1858.—*Baden Powell* in his Order of Nature, 1859, and his essay on the Evidences (in the Essays and Reviews, 9th ed., 1861), attacks the whole argument from miracles; comp. *D. R. Goodwin* in Am. Theol. Rev., July, '61; and Christ. Remembr., July, '61.]

Among orthodox theologians, *Bengel* and *Crusius* in particular treated of prophetic theology, and attached great importance not only to the prophecies, but also to the types of the Old Testament (comp. § 277). The latter supernaturalists did not go quite so far. After the antiquity of some prophecies (*e. g.* those of Daniel) had been impugned, and the Messianic prophecies had been referred to other historical events, the rationalists at last maintained that in the Old Testament there are no prophecies at all referring to Christ, to say nothing of the types. See *Eckermann*, Theologische Beiträge, i. 1, p. 7, ss., and comp. the literature given by *Bretschneider*, Entwurf, p. 207, ss. The adherents of the modern moderate orthodoxy did not pay so much attention to the announcement of particular and more incidental events as to the internal necessity of the historical development of the kingdom of heaven, in which the earlier periods are prophetic of those

which take place in later times, and according to which everything finds its higher fulfilment in Christ, who is the centre of the history of the world. See *Herder*, Dogmatik, p. 196, ss. *Schleiermacher*, Darstellung des theologischen Studiums, § 46; Glaubenslehre, i. p. 105. There is, however, a difference of opinion between *Twesten*, i. p. 372, ss., and *Nitzsch*, p. 66, on the one hand, and *De Wette*, p. 36 (§ 24, *b*), and *Hase*, p. 209, on the other. —*Hofmann* in his Weissagung und Erfüllung (Nördlingen, 1841–4, 2 Thle. and in his Schriftbeweis, 1852 [new ed., 1859], endeavors (in the sense of a speculative mysticism) to give a profounder view of the idea of prophecy. *Lutz* (1849), represents a cautious hermeneutics; see particularly 2 Divis. C. 1 and 2. [On *Hofmann*, see Princeton Rev., April, 1859. Comp. also *Delitzsch*, Bibl-proph. Theologie, 1845. *Hävernick*, Theol. des alten Test., 1848. *Reinke*, Messianische Weissagungen, Giessen, 2, 1860. *G. Baur*, Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Weissagung. Giessen, 1861, *Tholuck*, Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen, 2te. Aufl., 1861. *Hengstenberg's* Christology, transl. by *Reuel Keith*, 3, 1836; new edition, with Hengstenberg's modified views, in Clark's Foreign Theol. Library, 4 vols., 1854–8. The Messianic prophecies are also fully discussed in *John Pye Smith's* Scripture Testimony, 3 vols. Among the older works, see *John Davison*, d. 1834), Disc. on Prophecy, 5th ed., Oxf., 1845, delivered at the Warburtonian Lecture, 1825; in the same series, Lectures by *Hurd*, *Nares*, *Pearson*, *Nolan*, *McCaul*, etc.—*John Maclaurin*, Evang. Proph. relating to the Messiah (Works, *Goold's* ed., 1860, vol. 2).—The nature of prophecy is discussed by *S. Lee*, Cambr., 1849; *S. H. Turner*, Origin, Character, etc., of Proph., 1852; *Moses Stuart*, Hints, 2d ed., 1842; *P. Fairbairn* (of Glasgow), Nature and Functions, Edbg., 1856, Phila., 1857; *W. Lee* in his Lectures on Inspiration, Lect. iv.—*Bunsen's* views are rehearsed by *Rowland Williams* in the (Oxford) Essays and Reviews.]

The views of *Swedenborg* concerning the nature and significance of the *sacred Scriptures* were peculiar; see *Hauber*, Swedenborgs Ansicht von der heiligen Schrift (Tübinger Zeitschrift, 1840, part 4, p. 32, ss.). He regarded (like the supernaturalists) the Scriptures as the Word of God, but he differed from the latter in applying this appellation not to what we commonly call the sacred Scriptures, but to another Scripture antecedent to ours—viz., the Scripture of angels, which is both antecedent and superior to the terrestrial. As regards the empirical Scriptures, he has his own Canon (comp. *Hauber*, p. 80), and in the writings, which he admits as canonical, he makes a distinction between those passages in which God himself speaks (quando e cathedra loquitur), and those in which angels speak in his name. But even in these cases a *new revelation* is necessary, that the *spiritual* meaning of Scripture may be apprehended by all readers. This spiritual sense, too, is a sense before the sense, to which we cannot attain by rising from beneath upward, but which must be imparted from above downward.—Play with symbols and analogies.—Swedenborg's doctrine about the Scriptures was closely connected with his christological views.—On *Oetinger's* "massive" views of Scripture, see the Preliminaries to his Theology (Stuttg., 1842), and *Auberlen*, p. 339, *sq.*, et passim.

As regards the relation in which the Old Testament stands to the New, we find that those rationalists who, after the example of Kant, regarded the sacred Scriptures merely as a means of edification, made but a slight distinction between the one and the other, because there was in the Old Test. (*e. g.* in the book of Proverbs) much that was subservient to moral purposes. Nor did they concern themselves much about the difference between canonical and apocryphal writings (some even preferred the book of Jesus

Sirach to the writings of Paul and John.)—But even some orthodox theologians were induced, by idealistic and poetical tendencies, to give the preference to the Old Testament. Thus *Herder* is manifestly more supernaturalistic in respect to the Old Testament, than to the New. *De Wette*, too, was inclined to concede to the Old Test. (so far as religion must assume an æsthetic form) on account of its sacred poetry, a higher rank than to the New (see his Religion und Theologie, 212). *Umbreit* also has this tendency in a special degree.—On the other hand, some rationalists attached greater importance to the New Testament. Comp. *Wegscheider*, T. i. c. l. § 32. *Schleiermacher*, in harmony with his entire theological system, ascribed normative authority to the New Testament alone, asserting that the Old Testament has only historical significance; Glaubenslehre, ii. § 132 The advocates of modern supernaturalism have again attached special importance to the Old Testament, and written elaborate expositions upon its christology and eschatology (*e. g. Hengstenberg*, *Hävernick*, *Auberlen*, *Hofmann*, *Kurtz*, *Delitzsch*, *Baumgarten*). On the other hand, a more critical and historical point of view has been taken by *Bleek*, *Hitzig*, *Vatke*, *Knobel*, *Stähelin*, and others; while *Ewald* represents a peculiar tendency.

SECOND DIVISION.

THEOLOGY PROPER. CREATION AND PROVIDENCE. THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING ANGELS AND DEVILS.

§ 293.

DEISM. THEISM. PANTHEISM.

[*George Weissenborn*, Vorlesungen über Pantheismus und Theismus, Marburg., 1859. *Edward Böhmer*, De Pantheismi Nominis Origine et Usu et Notione, Halæ Saxonum, 1851.]

The contrast between Rationalism and the earlier Supernaturalism manifested itself less distinctly in the doctrine concerning God, and the relation in which he stands to the world. The adherents of both systems retained the theistic distinction between God and the world, though they often degenerated into a dead and mechanical deism. There was, however, this difference, that the supernaturalist admitted occasional acts of interference on the part of God in the workings of the machine, which otherwise ran on of itself in its regular course,[1] while this was denied by the more strict Rationalists. Of greater importance is the distinction between this theistico-deistic theory and the pantheistic system.[2] The latter in some cases has shown itself partly as pure pantheism (atheistic in fact), sometimes as theism, which has the appearance of pantheism only as contrasted with the dead deism referred to.[3]

[1] Thus in the case of answers granted to prayer, and of miracles. Compare the mechanical theory of miracles propounded by *Reinhard*, p. 230, ss.

[2] Pantheism has been very differently defined. According to *Wegscheider*, p. 250, Pantheism is: Ea sententia, qua naturam divinam mundo supponunt et Deum ac mundum unum idemque esse statuunt. Both rationalists and supernaturalists have on moral grounds combated this kind of pantheism, even the mere appearance of it; the adherents of the speculative philosophy, however, rejected this definition: see *Hegel*, Encyclopædie, 2d edit., p. 521. [*Böhmer*, De Pantheismi Nom. etc., ubi supra, says, that the word pantheism was first used in the title to one of Toland's books, 1705

(Socinianisme truly stated....to which is prefixed Indifference in Disputes recommended by a Pantheist to an Orthodox Friend); also in his Pantheisticum, s. Formula celebranda Societatis Socraticæ, 1720. It is not alluded to by Bentley or Bayle.—*Weissenborn*, ubi supra, defines pantheism as the system which identifies God and the *all of things*, or the *unity of things*. There have been six forms: 1. Mechanical, or materialistic—God the mechanical unity of existence. 2. Ontological (abstract unity) pantheism—the one substance in all; Spinoza. 3. Dynamic pantheism. 4. Psychical pantheism—God is the soul of the World. 5. Ethical pantheism—God is the universal moral order; Fichte. 6. Logical pantheism: Hegel.]

[3] Thus *Herder* said concerning Spinoza: he was an archtheist before all theists (Dogmatik, p. 129, comp. his discourses, especially that on God.) A controversy was carried on respecting the Pantheism of *Schleiermacher* (as seen particularly in his: Reden über die Religion); he was charged with holding pantheistic principles by *Röhr*, but defended by *Karsten* (Rostock, 1835). *Henke* pronounced a more favorable opinion respecting the theistico-pantheistic tendency:—Lineam. § xxvi: Summa autem injuria omnes illi Atheorum numero accensentur, qui summum Numen ab hoc universo secretum ac disparatum cogitare nesciunt, maluntque Deum rerum omnium causam *immanentem* quam *transeuntem* dici, nec tamen id, quod perpetuo *est*, commiscent cum illo, quod perpetuo *fit*. Quorum error, profecto magis fanaticus quam impius, *Pantheismus* et *Spinozismus* vocatur, si modo error est Numinis, omnibus rebus præsentissimi cogitatio, a qua neque ipse Paulus admodum abhorruisse videtur (Act. xvii. 27–29) et quæ amice satis conciliari potest cum Numinis moribus intelligentium naturarum providentis notione. Comp. *Hase*, Dogmatik, p. 150.—Modern orthodox theologians and philosophers are laboring so to represent the doctrine of a personal God, that we may apprehend him neither (in the manner of the deists) as existing *without* and *separate from* the world; nor (in the manner of the pantheists) as existing merely *in* and wholly *connected with* the world; but (in the manner of the theists) as a being that exists at the same time in and above the world, and yet distinctly separated from it. Atheism comes out, naked and unveiled in *Feuerbach's* Essence of Christianity, p. 20: "The divine essence is nothing but the human essence, or, better still, the nature of man purified, freed from the limits of the individual man, and viewed objectively, *i. e.* contemplated and reverenced as another nature, distinguished from man. All determinations (definitions) of the divine nature are therefore human determinations."*

* The materialism represented by *Vogt*, *Moleschott*, *Büchner*, and others, lies of course outside of the history of doctrines. [The chief work of *Moleschott* is his Kreislauf des Lebens, 1852. *Rudolf Wagner*, against materialism in his Menschenschöpfung und Seelensubstanz, 1824, and, Ueber Wissen und Glauben, 1854. *Vogt* replied in his Köhlerglaube und Wissenschaft, 4te. Aufl., 1856. *L. Büchner*, Kraft und Stoff, 2te. Aufl., 1858: and, Natur und Geist, 1857. *H. Czolbe*, Neue Darstellung des Sensualismus, 1855. In reply to the materialists: *Schaller*, Leib und Seele, 3te. Ausg., 1858; *F. Fabri*, Briefe gegen den Materialismus, 1856: *R. Wagner*, Kampf um die Seele, 1857: *Frauenstädt*, Der Materialismus (against Büchner); *Ulrici* in Zeitschrift f. d. Philosophie, 1860.—On the recent English atheism, "Secularism," (*Holyoake*, *Holdreth*), see Christ. Exam., Nov., 1859: on *Hennel*, see Isaac Taylor, in North British, Nov., 1860.]

§ 294.

THE EXISTENCE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

Up to the time of Kant, theologians continued to prove the existence of God much in the same way as had been done in former periods, some laying greater stress upon one mode of argumentation, others endeavoring to demonstrate the superiority of another.[1] But after *Kant* showed that the usual arguments do not establish what they are intended to prove,[2] and had substituted the moral argument,[3] these proofs gradually disappeared from the German scientific works on the subject. The *physico-theological* proof, however, was retained, because of its adaptation to the wants of the people and the young.[4] *Schleiermacher* returned to man's original consciousness of God, which is antecedent to all proofs,[5] and most modern theologians followed his example; while the adherents of the speculative philosophy again pointed out the more profound significance of the former arguments.[6] The same may be said in reference to the divine attributes,[7] which Schleiermacher regarded as subjective, *i. e.* as the reflex of the consciousness of God in man.[8] On the other hand, the speculative philosophers ascribed to them reality, though in a different sense from that commonly attached to this expression.[9]

[1] *Fénélon*, Démonstration de l'Existence de Dieu, Par., 1712. The *Ontological* argument was propounded by *Mendelssohn*, Morgenstunden, Berlin, 1785, and others; the *cosmological* by *Baumgarten*, Glaubenslehre, i. (Appendix to § 13, p. 923); the *physico-theological* by *Derham*, Physico-theology, or a Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God from his Works, Lond., 1714; *Sander*, *Bonnet*, and many others.

[2] In his: Kritik der reinen Vernunft, iii. 3, p. 611, ss. (3d edit. Riga, 1790). In his opinion the existence of God can be proved on speculative grounds only in a threefold manner; either by the physico-theological, or the cosmological, or the ontological argument. These are the only modes of argumentation, nor is it possible that there should be more.—*The ontological proof is not admissible*, because its advocates confound a logical predicate with a real. "A hundred real dollars do not contain anything more than a hundred possible.... But in reference to my property a hundred real dollars are more than the mere idea of that sum (*i. e.* of its possibility.")...."The idea of a supreme being is in many respects a very profitable idea; but because it is a *mere idea*, it cannot by itself enlarge our knowledge of that which exists;" for a "man might as well increase his knowledge by mere ideas, as a merchant augment his property by adding some ciphers to the sum total on his books." (Comp. Gaunilo against Anselm; ante, vol. i., p. 434.) *In opposition to the cosmological proof*, he urged that "its advocates commit an Ignoratio elenchi, *i. e.* they promise to show us a new way, but

bring us back to the old (ontological) proof, because their argument is also founded on a dialectic fiction." *In reference to the physico-theological proof*, he said: "This argument is always deserving of our respect. It is the earliest, clearest, and most adapted to common sense. It enlivens the study of nature, from which also it derives its existence, and through which it obtains new vigor. It shows to us an object and designs where we should not have discovered these by independent observation, and enlarges our knowledge of nature by making us acquainted with a special unity whose principle is above nature. But this knowledge exerts a reacting influence upon its cause—viz. the idea from which it derives its origin; and thus it confirms the belief in a supreme creator, so that it becomes an irresistible conviction.—Nevertheless this argument cannot secure apodictical certainty: at the utmost it might prove the existence of a *builder of the world*, but not of a *creator of the world*."

[3] Comp. Raymund of Sabunde, vol. i., p. 437. *Kant*, Kritik der reinen Vernunft, p. 832 ss.; Kritik der praktischen Vernunft, p. 233 ss. Morality, and a degree of happiness befitting it, are the two elements constituting the supreme good. But the virtuous do not always attain it. There must, therefore, be a compensation in the world to come. (Thus the same argument is used to prove the immortality of the soul.) At the same time there must be a being that possesses both the requisite intelligence and the will to bring about this compensation. Hence the existence of God is a postulate of practical reason.

[4] Especially in England; see *W. Paley*, Natural Theology, or Evidences of the existence and attributes of the Deity, 16th edit., 1817; translated into German, Manh., 1823; with additions by *Lord Brougham* and *Sir Charles Bell*, translated into German by *Hauff*, Stuttg., 1837. The Bridgewater Treatises, 1836 ss., comp. *W. Müller*, Kritik des physico-theologischen Beweises in *Röhr's* Magazin, vol. iv., part 1, 1831, p. 1–35.

[5] Glaubenslehre, i., § 32 ss.

[6] *Hegel*, Vorlesungen über die Beweise vom Dasein Gottes; Appendix to the second volume of his Philosophy of Religion. *Strauss*, Dogmatik, i., p. 400: "The cosmological argument proves God to be the being existing in all beings; the physico-theological shows him to be the life existing in all that lives; the historical and moral arguments prove that he is the moral governor of the world; and lastly, the ontological shows that he is the Spirit existing in all spirits, the Thought in all thinking beings." Comp. *Weisse*, Phil. Dogmatik, i., § 296–366.

[7] *Reinhard*, Dogmatik, p. 90 ss., divided the attributes of God into quiescent and active attributes, etc. *Bruch* attempted a new revision of the theory of the attributes in his Lehre von den göttlichen Eigenschaften, Hamb., 1842. For further statements see *Nitzsch*, in the article God, in Herzog's Realencyclop., v. 261 sq. [On the immutability of God, see particularly *Dorner*, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1859–60.]

[8] Glaubenslehre, i., § 50.

[9] *Hegel*, Encyclopædie, i., § 36, p. 73 (see Strauss, Dogmatik, i., p. 542.) Comp. *J. P. Lange*, ii. 60 sq.; *Ebrard*, i. 219; *Weisse*, § 482–537.

§ 295.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

Lücke, Die immanente Wesenstrinität. in the Studien und Kritiken, 1840; in reply, *Nitzsch*, ibid., 1841. [*Twesten*, Dogmatik, i., transl. in Bibliotheca Sacra, iii., iv.]

Although the church doctrine of the Trinity had not been materially altered during the period of the Reformation, it was now attacked by numerous opponents. Not only did Arianism make its appearance in England, as an isolated phenomenon, but various modifications of Socinianism also found their way into German theology.[1] The rationalists, were properly speaking, pure Unitarians;[2] on the other hand, some supernaturalists the more they planted themselves on the Biblical standpoint, yielded somewhat of the strict doctrine of *ecclesiastical* orthodoxy.[3] *Swedenborg* found the Trinity in the person of Christ.[4] The adherents of the school of *Zinzendorf* exposed themselves to the charge of destroying the relation in which the persons stand to each other, by paying excessive homage to the Son.[5] Modern theologians have again apprehended the more profound speculative basis of this doctrine; but while some (after the example of *Schleiermacher*) refer the Trinity, after the manner of Sabellius, to the revealed deity;[6] others (both the speculative, and the strict orthodox) think that it has respect to the essence of the deity.[7] The place which they assign to the doctrine of the Trinity, in their systems, and the degree of importance which they attach to it, depend upon their views in these respects.[8]

[1] *Samuel Clarke* was dismissed from his post as court preacher (1714) in the reign of Queen Anne, on account of his work concerning the Trinity (1712). He maintained that the Son was subordinate to the Father, and the Holy Spirit to both the Father and the Son; nor did he afterwards alter his opinion. Comp. *Schlegel*, Kirchengeschichte des 18 Jahrhund. ii. p. 746, ss. [See above, § 225, *b*, note 51, and § 234, note 11.] *J. J. Wettstein* compared the Son of God to a prime minister, and his relation to the Father, to that of a prime minister to his monarch, or of a curate to his rector; see *Hagenbach*, Ueber Wettstein in Illgens Zeitschrift für historische Theologie. The theory of subordination was also adopted by other German theologians. See *Töllner*, Theologische Untersuchungen, 1762, vol. i. part i. He combated the opinion that the doctrine of the Trinity is a fundamental doctrine; see his Vermischte Aufsätze, ii. 1.

[2] According to *Wegscheider*, Institut. § 93, the doctrine of the Trinity belongs to those doctrines—quæ justa auctoritate certoque fundamento destituta sunt; comp. *Henke*, Lineam. lxix.

[3] Thus *J. A. Ulsperger*, kurzgefafstes System seines Vortrags von Gottes Dreieinigkeit, Augsb., 1777. The author of this work maintained, that the

divine predicates, *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, have reference on y to the work of redemption (Trinity of revelation); he did not deny a Trinity of nature, which he was willing to adore as a mystery, but he rejected the idea that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are its necessary and personal predicates.

[4] He taught that, instead of a Trinity of *persons* (set forth in the symbols of the church), we must hold a Trinity of the *person*, by which he understood, that that which is divine in Christ is the *Father*, that the divine united with the human is the *Son*, and the divine which proceeds from him is the *Holy Spirit*. The first Christians, in their simplicity, believed in *three persons* because they understood everything in its literal sense. The orthodox Trinitarians may also go to heaven, where they will be enlightened on this subject. But no one can be admitted into heaven who believes in the existence of *three Gods*, though with his mouth he may confess only *one*; for the entire life of heaven, and the wisdom of all the angels, is founded on the recognition and confession of *one* God, and on the belief that that *one* God is also man; and that *he*, who is at the same time God and man, is the Lord (Jehovah, Zebaoth, Shaddai.) See his Divine Revelation, i. (die Lehre des neuen Jerusalem vom Herrn, edit. by *Tafel*, 1823), p. 118, ss.

[5] See *Bengel*, Abriss der sogenannten Brüdergemeinde, pp. 74, 75: "Can any one approve of the doctrine of Zinzendorf, who refuses to attribute the work of creation to the Father, and maintains that he (the Father) was either ministering to and assisting his Son, or looking at his work, or enjoying divine rest, while the latter was creating the world? *who further ascribes so many other things which also belong to the Father, to the Son alone?* who also ascribes to the Holy Ghost a kind of motherhood as a personal characteristic? and, lastly, who treats, in so presumptuous a way, the divine doctrine of the ever-blessed Deity?" p. 119: "We ought not to slip over the Son, but neither also the Father, as if he were of no account. The latter, compared with the former, is a new, and hence a great pleasure for the devil."—Bengel also finds fault with the *familiar* style in which Zinzendorf treats these mysteries. Comp. p. 78, ss. [and *Von der Goltz*, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1861.] *Wackernagel*, Lesebuch, iii. p. 1063. In the Idea Fidei Fratrum is no particular locus de *Trinitate*, but a section concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost (§ 84). The doctrine in question is there simply treated in its scriptural aspects, to which is added: "It is not only vain and foolish, but also dangerous, to descend into the depths of the Deity, and that incomprehensible eternity, of which nothing is revealed to us. Therefore we do not inquire into those things which belong to the depths of the Deity, because we hold such a course to be better than to endeavor to determine that which Scripture has not determined. It clearly teaches us: God has an only-begotten Son whom he has offered for us; there is also one Holy Ghost who is uncreated, but proceeds from the Father, and is sent to us through Christ."

[6] *Schleiermacher*, Treatise on Sabellius in the Berliner Zeitschrift [translated by *Moses Stuart*, in Biblical Repos. (Andov.), first series, vol. v.]: Glaubenslehre, ii. § 170, ss. p. 574, ss. *De Wette*, kirkliche Dogmatik,

§ 43, 44 (pp. 81, 82). *Twesten*, Dogmatik, ii. p. 179, ss. *Lücke*, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1840, part 1, p. 91. On the other side: *Nitzsch*, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1841, part 2.

[1] *Lessing* (Erziehung des Menschengeschlechtes, § 73) had already said: 'What if this doctrine (of the Trinity) should lead human reason to acknowledge, that God cannot possibly be understood to be *one*, in that sense in which all finite things are *one*? that his unity must be a transcendental unity which does not exclude a kind of plurality." *Schelling*, Methode des akademischen Studiums, p. 102: "It is clear that the idea of a Trinity is absurd, unless it be considered on speculative grounds.... The incarnation of God is an eternal incarnation."....Comp. p. 184. Comp. *Blasche*, Das Böse, etc., pp. 106, 107. *Hegel*, Religionsphilosophie, vol. ii., p. 230, ss.: "By God being a living spirit, we understand that he can distinguish himself from himself, produce Another, and in this Other remain identical with himself. This becoming Another, is the eternal absorption and yet production of himself." P. 261: "That which first existed was the *idea* in its simple universality, the *Father*. The second is the particular, the idea in its manifestation, the *Son*—viz., the idea in its external existence; so that the external manifestation is a reflex of the first, and is known as the divine idea, the identity of the divine with the human. The third is this consciousness, God as the *Holy Spirit;* and this spirit, as existing, is the church.—*Daub* makes a distinction between *Deus a quo, in quo, et cui satis est Deus;* Theologum. p. 110. *Marheineke*, Dogmatik, p. 260: "In a direct and abstract sense God is only the identity, the being which is not yet Thought, but only Spirit, *per se* (*an sich*)—the Father. In order to be this in reality, he distinguishes himself from himself, sets himself as another in distinction from himself; and in so far as he exists *for* himself in this separate existence, he is the Son. But inasmuch as he refers himself to himself, and abrogates this separate existence, he is a being existing in and for himself [Germ. An und für sich seiender], or Spirit."—Concerning the relation in which this speculative Trinity stands to the ecclesiastical doctrine, see *Strauss*, Dogmatik, i. p. 492; and *Weisse*, Phil. Dogmatik, § 394–481, especially § 409. The latter, from the speculative point of view, resolves the Trinity thus: the divine Reason—the Father; the divine heart (*Gemüth*), and the *nature-in-God*—the Son; the divine will—the Holy Ghost.

[2] *Schleiermacher* and *Hase* assign to it the last place in their systems (Hase makes it the sum and conclusion of the Christology); the adherents of Hegel the first; the former consider it the topstone, the latter the foundation of the building. This is still further connected with their views about the nature of religion. *Rothe* is nearest right, when he designates the Trinitarian idea of God, as set forth in Christian speculation, as entirely different from the Trinitarian idea in the church doctrine; and he openly grants that the Biblical terms, Father, Son, and Spirit, designate wholly different relations of God from those of his immanent mode of being (Theol. Ethik, i. 77, *sq.*) Compare among the recent divines, *Lange*, ii. 123, *sq.* *Liebner*, i. 67 (criticising the latest discussions). *Martensen*, 95, *sq.* *Ebrard*, i. 141, *sq.*

§ 296.

Creation and Preservation of the World. Providence. Theodicy.

After the followers of the Wolfian philosophy, and the like, had in vain endeavored to reconcile the Mosaic account of the creation with the results and hypotheses of their natural philosophy and metaphysics,[1] *Herder*, by his genial interpretation rescued this story from their hands, and brought it back to the sphere of sacred poetry, recognizing its internal truthfulness.[2] Since that time only a few writers have defended its literal meaning.[3] The definitions concerning the *idea of creation itself*, and the cognate ideas of *preservation*, *providence*, and the *government of the world*, are closely connected with the systems of *Deism*, *Theism*, *and Pantheism*[4] (comp. § 293). The so-called Theodicy (*i. e.* the mode of explaining the existence of evil in the world)[5] is also connected with these fundamental views, and at the same time passes over into the doctrines respecting demonology and anthropology (see below).

[1] Comp. the views entertained by *Michaelis* and others, in the work of Herder (note 2); for further particulars see *Bretschneider* Entwicklung, p. 450, ss. *Silberschlag*, Geogonie, oder Erklärung der mosaischen Schöpfungsgeschichte, Berlin, 1780–83, 3 voll., 4to. New attempts to save the record from the standpoint of the natural sciences, by *Buckland*, *Wagner*, *Pfaff*, *Fabri*, and others. [*Hugh Miller*, *John Pye Smith*, *Lyell*, President *Hitchcock*; *Dawes'* Archaia, etc.] Comp. *Ebrard*, Die Weltanschauung der Bibel und die Naturwissenschaft, in the "Zukunft der Kirche," Jahrg., 1847. [*Keil*, Die biblische Schöpfungsgeschichte und die geologische Erdbildungstheorien, in Theol. Zeitschrift, 1860, Aug. *Keerl*, Der Mensch, das Ebenbild Gottes, i. 1860.]

[2] *Herder* in his work, Die älteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlects, eine nach Jahrhunderten enthüllte heilige Schrift., 1774, ss. (Comp. the review in the Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek xxv. p. 24, xxx. p. 53); Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit, vol. ii. p. 303, ss.; Geist der hebræischen Poesie, i. p. 139, ss.

[3] Comp. Bretschneider, p. 451. Supernaturalists also, such as *Reinhard* (p. 167, ss.), and others, conceded something to modern criticism. In more recent times, however, the theory of six periods (instead of days) has had earnest advocates. [See *Tayler Lewis*, Six Days of Creation, and Bible and Science, or the World-Problem, 1856.]

[4] The idea of *a creation out of nothing* is founded on theistic views of the world. These views are deistic, when the creation and preservation of the world are too much separated from each other, and the connection existing between them is destroyed; they become pantheistic, when creation

appears as a mere part of preservation. Comp. the passages from the works of *Fichte*, *Hegel*, and *Marheineke*, collected by *Hase*, p. 179; and *Schleiermacher*, christliche Glaubenslehre, i. § 40; and *Weisse*, Phil. Dogmatik, § 538–556.—Further, the idea of *providence* is theistic, and intimately connected with the idea of a personal God; it is wanting in the schemes of deism and pantheism, which run into fatalism on the one side or the other.

[6] *C. H. Blasche*, das Böse in Einklange mit der Weltordnung dargestellt, Leipz., 1827. He has revived the earlier notion, that evil is necessary in order to form a contrast with good, etc. So, too, with the adherents of the latest school. Among the more recent, see *Rothe*, iii. 170; *Martensen*, 107; *Ebrard*, i. 201. [Comp. particularly the New England discussions, on Sin as the necessary means of the greatest good: above, § 285, *d*.]

§ 297.

THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING ANGELS AND DEMONS.

During the prosaic age the belief in the existence and agency of angels had almost wholly disappeared, and supernaturalists themselves, who, on the authority of Scripture, continued to believe in their existence, knew not what to do with them.[1] On the other hand, the enthusiastic *Swedenborg* looked only the more boldly into the angelic world, but most arbitrarily substituted the notion of glorified men for the Scriptural idea of angels, and denied the personal existence of the devil.[2] The devil was the subject of chief derision with the advocates of what were called the enlightened views of the age. *Semler* explained (after the example of *Bekker*) the demoniacal possessions by a reference to empirical psychology.[4] But even those supernaturalists who, on exegetical grounds, believed in the reality of the demoniacal possessions recorded in the New Testament, were far from asserting their possibility in our age.[4] In the present century, however, the belief in demoniacal possessions as affecting the body, which had continued to obtain among the lower orders of the people notwithstanding the progress of rationalism, was revived among the educated classes of Protestants themselves, for the most part in connection with the phenomena of animal magnetism and clairvoyance.[5] The doctrine concerning the devil too, assumed a new dogmatic significancy. *Schleiermacher* vindicated its poetic rights—viz. as regards sacred poetry;[6] while *Daub* endeavored to assign a kind of personal existence to the author of evil: the latter, however, introduced some Manichean elements into this doctrine.[7] Most of our theologians are now of opinion that where the doctrine concerning sin is rightly understood, the belief in the metaphysical existence of the devil is of subordinate importance; inasmuch as, according to the strictness of Scripture, he belongs at

any rate to the order of finite beings, over whose temptations (however they may show themselves) the Christian man is bound to have the victory.[8]—The doctrine respecting *angels* has also again come to honor among the latest writers on systematic theology, by some considered rather in a philosophic and idealizing sense,[9] by others simply referred to the Scriptural declarations.[10]

[1] Thus *e. g. Reinhard*, p. 176 ss. He does not venture to decide which office they have in the present time (p. 191). *Storr*, § 49 (quoted by *Hase*, Dogmatik, p. 237).

[2] Divine Revelation, i., p. 87: "Men are always surrounded by spirits and angels of God, who understand everything spiritually, because they themselves possess a spiritual nature. After death men are also instructed by angels," p. 102; comp. ii., p. 102, 126, 178, 226. In many places Swedenborg relates his discourses with angels who, in his opinion, are human beings. Angels breathe as well as men, their hearts also beat; they breathe according to the measure of Divine wisdom which they receive from the Lord; their hearts beat according to the measure of Divine love which they receive from the Lord, p. 112, comp. p. 220. Angels and spirits are also men; for all the good and true which proceeds from man is human in its form; but the Lord is the Divine-Good, and the Divine-True itself, hence he is man himself, from whom every man is man, i., p. 112. Because angels are angels on account of the degree of love and wisdom which they possess, and the same is the case with men, it is evident, that on account of the good connected with the true, angels are angels of heaven, and men are men of the church, p. 157. The wisdom of angels consists in the power to see and to apprehend what they think, p. 213. All that takes place in the spiritual world, is correspondence; for it is in correspondence with the inclinations of angels and spirits; p. 250.—In opposition to the doctrine of the church, that the angels were first created, and that the devil is a fallen angel, Swedenborg professes (p. 180) that he was taught by the angels themselves, that in the whole heaven there is not one single angel who was created at first, nor in the whole of hell one single devil who was created as an angel of light, etc. but that *all angels*, both in heaven and in hell, *derive their origin from the human race*.—Hell and devil are one and the same, and angels and heaven are one and the same; comp. p. 303. That which is in man—viz. his spirit—is, according to its true nature, an angel, p. 281, therefore man is created to become an angel, p. 289. In some places Swedenborg understands the Scriptural term *angel* in a symbolical sense. Comp. vol. ii., p. 6, 16, 18, 52, 307.

[3] De Dæmoniacis, 1760 (4th ed., 1779.)—Versuch einer biblischen Dæmonologie, Halle, 1776.

[4] *Reinhard*, p. 185 ss., p. 206, speaks only of those diseases which the devil is said to have caused in the times of Christ and his apostles. Comp. p. 211 "We admit such corporeal possessions in the narratives of the gospel only on the testimony of Christ and his apostles. Accordingly, as long as such an authentic testimony is wanting in modern times, no man is justified

in maintaining that a diseased man is truly possessed with a devil." Comp. *Storr*, § 52 (quoted by *Hase*, p. 238.) [On *Farmer*, see § 292, note 1.]

[5] The exorcisms practised by *Gassner*, a member of the Roman Catholic Church (from the year 1773). See *Walch*, neueste Religionsgeschichte, vol. vi., p. 371, p. 541 ss. *Justinus Kerner* (who belongs to the Protestant Church), Die Scherin von Prevorst, Stuttg., 1832, 2 vols.; Ueber das Besessensein, Heilbr., 1833. Geschichte Bessessener neuerer Zeit, nebst Reflexionen von *Eschenmayer*, Karlsruhe, 1836.

[6] Glaubenslehre, i. § 45, p. 243.

[7] Judas Ischariot, oder das Böse im Verhältnisse zum Guten betrachtet, 2 parts in 3 sections. Heidelb. 1816–19. Comp. *Kant*, Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, p. 99 ss. Among the recent divines *Martensen* has endeavored to prove the existence of the devil on biblical and speculative grounds; Dogmatik, 170 *sq.* *Lücke*, in reply in the Zeitschrift f. Christl. Wissenschaft, Febr., 1851. *Ebrard* (i. 392) shows the difference between the Biblical representations and the later perversions. See also *Lange*, ii. 559, *sq.* [*Twesten* on Doctrine respecting Angels, transl. from his Dogmatik, in Biliotheca Sacra, i. 768–793, ii. 108–140. *Whately*, Scriptural Doctrine of Good and Evil Spirits, Lond., 1851. Prof. *Stuart*, on Angelology, in Robinson's Bib. Sacra, 1843. Analogues of Satan, Christ. Exam., July, 1860; Theory of Personal Devil, ibid., Sept., 1861. Letters to the Rev. W. E. Channing, on the Existence and Agency of Fallen Spirits. By Canonicus, Boston, 1828.]

[8] *Kant*, l. c., p., 66. *Twesten*, Dogmatik, ii., p. 331 ss., Comp. p. 358–360.

[9] *Martensen*, Dogmatik, 119, conceives of the Angel-world, as the "world of ideas;" but "not ideas as they stand before abstract thought, but ideas viewed as living powers, acting spirits." The notion of personality he considers as changeable. "From the storm-wind that executes the orders of the Lord, to the seraph that stands before his throne, there is a manifold variety of angelic beings;" and "no speculation will ever be in a condition to decide how far there may be powers in creation, having such spirituality, that with personal consciousness they may serve or resist the Creator." *Lange* thinks that the angels are the spirits of the primeval world, ii. 578 sq. *Weisse* (Phil. Dogmatik), tries in respect to the angels to "steer clear of the Scylla of dogmatic superstition, as well as the Charybdis of materialistic unbelief;" and he does this by recurrence to the Böhme's idea of "*nature-spirits*, and *fountain-spirits*," and bringing them into connection with the attribute of God's glory.

[10] *Ebrard*, Dogmatik, i. 276 sq.

THIRD DIVISION.

ANTHROPOLOGY. CHRISTOLOGY. SOTERIOLOGY, AND THE ECONOMY OF REDEMPTION.

§ 298.

THE DOCTRINES CONCERNING MAN, SIN AND LIBERTY.

We should expect, as a matter of course, that in an age in which philosophical and theological works were full of "*Philanthropy* and *humanity*," much would be said concerning the nature, dignity and destination of man.[1] In opposition to Augustine's views, the excellency of the human nature was extolled, and (after the example of Rousseau) many indulged in fanciful representations of the ideal state of man.[2] While *enlightened* theologians erased the doctrine of original sin from their systems,[3] *Kant* on the contrary, himself pointed out the radical evil in man, but did not understand by it original sin in its ecclesiastical usage.[4] The adherents of the later speculative philosophy were also far from believing that the natural state of man was the normal one: they admitted that he had fallen from his original state, that a reconciliation had become necessary, and attached little importance to the Pelagian idea of liberty, upon which the rationalists had laid great stress. But a closer examination of their theory showed that this kind of original sin was identical with the finite character of human nature and human consciousness, and was a mere matter of natural necessity: so that the idea of sin and responsibility was destroyed, and a doctrine introduced which would prove fatal to the ethical standpoint, which rationalism had maintained from regard to practical morality.[5] In opposition to both these tendencies (the rationalistic and the speculative) the Pietists, and those theologians who returned to the old faith of the church, revived the doctrine of Augustine in its essential points,[6] to which the followers of *Schleiermacher* and those of like tendencies also adhered, though with various modifications.[7] On the other hand, the idealistic view of man, as God awakening to consciousness, was pressed with all its energy by the left side of the *Hegelian school*; and of course sin was regarded as only a vanishing

factor.[8] But thus it became only the more apparent, that at present the regeneration of the church and of theology are chiefly to be expected from a right understanding of the doctrine concerning sin.[9]

[1] It is worthy of notice, that physical and psychological anthropology, which had formerly been treated in connection with systematic theology, was now separated from it. *Man* was made the subject of philosophical treatises written in a popular style. See *Pope*, Essay on Man, 1733. *Spalding*, Bestimmung des Menschen, Lpz., 1748. *J. J. Zollikofer*, Predigten über die Würde des Menschen, Lpz., 1783. *J. Ith*, Anthropologie oder Philosophie des Menschen, vol. i. Winterthur, 1803. (For further particulars see *Bretschneider*, Entwurf, p. 493, ss.) *Herder* has most ably represented man in his purely human aspect.

[2] Comp. § 275. The modern system of education was, in particular founded on the doctrine of the excellency of human nature. Comp. *Campe*, Theophron, 1806, p. 234, ss.

[3] *Steinbart* (in the 5th section of his: System der reinen Philosophie). *Henke*, Lineamenta, lxxxi.: Cavendum est, ne hanc peccandi facultatem, hunc vitiorum fomitem cum ipsis vitiis, ignis materiam cum incendio permisceamus, atque propterea totum genus humanum perditum, corruptum, propter hanc suam indolem displicere Deo, vel parvulos adeo recens in lucem editos indignationi divinæ obnoxios esse dicamus, *quod ne de catulis quidem sanus quisquam ausit dicere*, etc. Quæ omnia (he then continues, p. lxxxiv.) ambiguitatis et erroris plena commenta sunt, pro lubitu arrepta, et præter sanæ rationis ac scripturæ sacræ assensum.

[4] Vom radicalen Bösen in der menschlichen Natur (Berliner Monatsschrift, April, 1792); Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, etc. (against the fantasies of pedagogues, pp. 4 and 5). The natural tendency to evil manifests itself in three different ways: 1. As frailty (fragilitas); 2. As impurity (impuritas, improbitas); 3. As malice and perversity (vitiositas, pravitas, perversitas). The proposition: Man is evil, means, that he is conscious of the moral law, but he thinks it consistent with his principles of action, occasionally to deviate from it. The proposition: He is *by nature* wicked, means, he is wicked as belonging to the *genus humanum*. (Vitiis nemo sine nascitur, Horat.) This tendency (to evil) has not its origin in the sensuality of man, but in his liberty, hence he is responsible for it. There are also different degrees of innate guilt (reatus). The culpa corresponds to frailty and impurity; the dolus (dolus malus) corresponds to malice.—Nevertheless Kant maintains (p. 37) that of all theories respecting the propagation of this original evil, that is the most incorrect, which represents us as having inherited it from our first parents; for what the poet says in reference to good, may also be applied to moral evil: Genus et proavos, *et quæ non fecimus ipsi*, vix ea nostra puto.—In his opinion the narrative of Adam's fall is only a symbol, which he explains according to his principles of moral interpretation, p. 40–44. Therefore the doctrine of innate evil is not of importance for *moral theology*, but only for moral discipline (p. 55). On this account Kant's theory of original evil does not lead to the doctrine

of redemption (in its ecclesiastical sense), but he comes to the conclusion: "That which man, considered from the moral point of view, *is* or *is* to be, whether good or evil, *depends on his own actions*" (p. 45). Comp. also § 298, on the economy of redemption. *Herder* therefore said: "Nobody knows how this original evil entered into the human nature, nor how it may escape from it." (Von Religion, Lehrmeinungen und Gebräuchen, pp. 204, 205.) For the further development of Kant's theory, see *Tieftrunk*, Censur, iii. p. 112, ss. The later rationalists rested satisfied with regarding evil as something which experience proves to exist among men, without tracing its origin to the sin of our first parents; nor did they deny that those who aspire after higher moral perfection may rise above sin. *Weyscheider*, § 118.

[5] *Schelling*, Methode des akademischen Studiums, p. 176. The new (Christian) world commences with a general fall, a breaking away of man from nature. The surrender to nature itself does not constitute sin, for, as long as it is not conscious of the opposite, this forms rather the golden age. The consciousness of this surrender destroys innocence, and therefore demands reconciliation and voluntary submission, in which liberty comes off both conquered and a conqueror. This is more fully developed by *Blasche*, l. c. p. 224: "Original sin did not propagate itself, because our first parents accidentally sinned, and all other men are their descendants, but because the first conscious life of man, and the continuance and growth of this consciousness, are an original act of sin. The propagation of sin does not take place so much by *physical*, as by *psychical* generation, by which we understand education,* on which the development of man's consciousness, in a social point of view, depends. The biblical narrative of the fall is an allegorical representation of the development of this consciousness on the part of our first parents. Their condition antecedent to this event, the life in paradise, the state of innocence, was (like the state of earliest infancy in general) an unconscious life of instinct; for all mental development commences with consciousness. From this it is evident, that as, in the physical creation, it is not good, but evil,† which is first, or primary, the same must be the case in the higher spiritual creation (the culture of the mind), which commences with consciousness. In the world of spirits good must first come into existence, and is based upon evil." (Comp. the theory of the Ophites, vol. i. § 62.)—*Hegel* defined original sin as the natural state (*das natürliche Ansichsein*) of man, so far as he is conscious of it. Philosophie der Religion, vol. i. p. 194, ss., ii. p. 208, ss. *Strauss*, Dogmatik, ii. p. 69–74.

[6] The Pietists and Methodists laid great stress upon the consciousness of sin (comp. § 277, 278). In the Idea Fidei Fratrum, § 50, ss., the doctrine of the deep natural corruption of mankind is treated of earnestly, yet not without suggestion of hope, with all the seriousness appropriate to this subject.—Concerning *Oetinger's* views of the nature of evil, see *Dorner*, Chris-

* "Education must necessarily first lead *man astray*, in his course towards spirituality, before it can lead him to virtue." (?)

† The word "sin" is here used in such a sense, that it may be applied even to *physical diseases*. *Kieser* in *Blasche*, ubi supra. But where all is sin, sin loses its significancy

tologie, pp. 310, 311.—*Swedenborg* departed from the church doctrine, inasmuch as he did not believe in original sin, properly speaking, but represented man as a free agent, who is placed between heaven and earth, and exposed to the influence of good and evil spirits. But still man derives from God all the good which he possesses. Comp. his Divine Revelation, ii. p. 147, ss.; Heaven and Hell, No. 589–596, and 597–603.—Among modern theologians, *Tholuck* first gave a more orthodox definition of sin in his work: Die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Versöhner, oder die wahre Weihe des Zweiflers. Hamb., 1823, 7th edit., 1851 [translated and publ. in Boston.] Comp. *Steudel*, *Korn*, and *Klaiber* (see *Bretschneider*, p. 53.*).

[7] These modifications chiefly consist in a renunciation of the strictly historical interpretation of the fall, which is also abandoned by *Tholuck* (Die Lehre von der Sünde, etc. Append. 3*) and the want of more precise definitions concerning the justitia originalis. Respecting the latter, *Schleiermacher* (Christliche Glaubenslehre, i. p. 336), gives it as his opinion, that idea of the justitia originalis cannot be demonstrated dialectically. On the other hand he maintains (l. c. vol. i. p. 412, ss.) the original depravity, and entire inability of every man to perform virtuous actions; this inability ceases only in connection with the work of redemption. *De Wette* asserted that the representations of (orthodox) Protestant writers were founded upon exaggerated views, but still defended them in opposition to the superficial theories of the rationalists: see Dogmatik, § 56. Comp. *Hase*, Dogmatik, pp. 102, 103.

[8] *Feuerbach*, Wesen des Christenthums, s. 49: "The incarnate God is only the manifestation of man become God—which, in fact, lies in the background of the religious consciousness; for the elevation of man to God necessarily precedes the condescension of God to man. Man was already *in God*, was *God himself*, before *God became man*. How otherwise could God become man. Ex nihilo nil fit."

[9] *Julius Müller*, die christliche Lehre von der Sünde, vol. i., New edit., Berl., 1844, vol. ii. ibid., 1844. Comp. with it, *G. Ritter*, über das Bose, etc., Theologische Mitarbeiten, ii. part 4), Breslau, 1839. *Rothe*, Ethik, ii. 170, *sq.*, partly against *Müller*. [*Rothe* puts the essence of sin more in the physical constitution.] *Martensen*, p. 144, *sq.* *Schenkel*, Gespräche über Protestantismus und Katholicismus, Heidelb., 1852, s. 128, *sq.* *Tholuck*, ubi supra. [*Müller's* theory of preexistence is also, under other relations, advocated by *Edward Beecher*, Conflict of Ages, Boston, 1853. See also Prest. *Marsh*, Three Discourses on Nature, Ground and Origin of Sin, in his Remains (1845), pp. 439–502. *Shedd*, Sin a Nature, and that Nature Guilt, in his Essays and Reviews.]

The dogma of the *Immaculate Conception of Mary* has also been awakened from the slumber in which it seemed to have sunk, and brought to a definitive decision by the Papal Bull of Dec. 8, 1854, yet not without weighty objections and opposition from Catholic quarters: see the Brief of

* *Reinhard* advocated the historical reality of the fall but thought the forbidden fruit *venomous*, on which account it caused the death of our first parents. (?) Dogmatik (3d edit.), p. 273.

Pope Pius IX., Feb. 2, 1849, and the answer of the Prussian bishops in *Gelzer's* Protest. Monatsblätter, ix. 2, s. 69, sq. The papal decision was prepared for, dogmatically, in particular by the works of *Perrone*, De immacul. B. Virg. Mariæ Conceptu, and of *Passaglia* (§ 178). Protestant polemics were also aroused against the doctrine; see *Julius Müller* (§ 178), and *G. A. Wimmer*, Ehrenrettung der seligen Jungfrau Maria gegen die päpstlichen Verunglimpfungen, Bremen, 1855. [Comp. Christ. Remembrancer, April, 1852; Methodist Quarterly, April, 1855. *Denzinger*, Lehre d. unbefleckten Empfängniss, 2d ed., 1855. Bp. *Malou* (of Bruges), L'immaculée Conception....comme Dogme de Foi, 2 Tomes, Bruxelles, 1857.—*Ballerini*, Sylloge Monumentorum ad Mysterium Conc. immacul. Virginis, etc., Rom., 1855.]

§ 299.

CHRISTOLOGY.

Dorner, über die Entwicklungsgeschichte der Christologie, besonders in neuern Zeiten, Tübinger Zeitschrift, 1835, part 4, p. 81, ss.; Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi, p. 250, ss. *Liebner*, Christologie, oder die christol. Einheit des dogmat. Systems, i. Gött., 1849. [*Thomasius*, Christi Person und Werk, 3 Bde. 2te. Aufl., 1859. *W. F. Gess*, Die Lehre d. Person Christi, 1856. *H. G. Hasse*, Leben des verklärten Erlösers, 1854. *E. W. Grinfield*, The Christian Cosmos: the Son of God the revealed Creator, 1856.]

The more the doctrine of the natural depravity of mankind was lost sight of, and the nature of man elevated, the more did specific difference between Jesus of Nazareth and the rest of mankind disappear. Thus Socinianism and Ebionitism were re-introduced into the Church, along with the Pelagian tendencies of the so-called period of illumination.[1] But there was still a deep interest in considering the human nature of Christ, *i. e.*, his character as a historical person, which was represented sometimes in noble, sometimes in trivial aspects, by different writers.[2] This led to a new historical estimate of his life,[3] which was best adapted to prepare the way for the revival of a belief in his higher nature, as surpassing the bounds of humanity. The views of *Kant* had given rise to an arbitrary distinction, unknown to the doctrine of the church, between an ideal and a historical Christ.[4] Only a small number of pious men (to which belonged some of the most eminent writers of the present period) retained the doctrine of Christ's divinity, with all the ardor of fervent love, amidst a gainsaying generation.[5] Some, *e. g.*, *Emmanuel Swedenborg*,[6] even went so far as to adopt notions bordering on enthusiasm and heresy. The Christian rationalists declared their belief in the historical Christ (the man Jesus), founded upon the critical interpretation of the accounts given by the evangelists (especially in the so-called synoptical gospels). They differed

most distinctly from the anti-Christian naturalism, in admitting that the founder of the Christian Church must have been possessed of the highest moral perfection, without directly asserting the dogma of the absolute sinlessness of Christ. The better class of the rationalists did not deny that Christ possessed miraculous and mysterious powers with the view of detracting from his honor, but in order to render him more accessible to men, to make his doctrine more intelligible, and his example more profitable.[7] On the other hand, the adherents of the speculative philosophy exerted themselves to the utmost in the defence of the *idea* of an incarnate God (which had been rejected by the rationalists), or of the unity of the divine with the human; and they thus exposed themselves to the danger of renouncing the historical manifestation of Christ, or even of converting his history into mere myths.[8] The advocates of modern theology, since *Schleiermacher*, consider it their task to show, that the divine and the human in Christ (the ideal and the historical), are most intimately connected with each other. Though they widely differ from each other in reference to particular points, as well as in the modes of argumentation which they use,[9] they all agree in admitting that the received ecclesiastical terms of *person* and *nature* are not sufficient to express the real relation.[10] It is also now generally acknowledged, that only more profound philosophical and historical investigations can justify to thinking minds the idea of a God-man, or prove, with the highest degree of historical evidence, that this idea is realised in the person of Jesus of Nazareth.[11]

[1] *Dorner*, Christologie, p. 255.

[2] The phrase, "*Jesus of Nazareth was a mere man*," can be very differently interpreted; there are all the grades between an impostor and an enthusiast, between the latter and an extraordinary messenger of God, a prophet, a worker of miracles, and, lastly, the Son of Man, after his resurrection raised to the heavens. All these terms have been applied to Christ (in an inverse order) from the period of Socinianism down to the publication of the "Wolfenbüttler Fragmente," and the "Natürliche Geschichte des Propheten von Nazareth," Bethlehem [Kopenhagen], 1800.

[3] Bringing the person of Christ into the sphere of history, and the endeavor to understand him like every other man in historical relations, could only in the end be subservient to the advancement of truth (hence the *Life of Jesus* is now so often described); for the ecclesiastical doctrine of the *true humanity* of the Redeemer must lose its significance without what may be called the *human* treatment of his history. In this respect *Herder* has distinguished himself above all other writers. Comp. his "Christliche Schriften," and the passages quoted in his "Dogmatik," p. 134, ss., 190, ss., 212, ss. And yet, while emphasizing what Christ has in common with the race, he has overlooked what raises him, as the Holy One, above the race.

In connection with his doctrine of original evil, *Kant* maintained the necessity of a restoration of man by means of his freedom. To attain unto this end, man stands in need of an ideal—viz., a human ideal which is presented to him in the scriptural doctrine concerning Christ (the personified idea of the good principle). The idea has its seat in our reason; for the practical purposes of an example, etc., a character is sufficient which resembles the idea as much as possible. It is not necessary to suppose a supernatural generation, though it cannot be absolutely denied that such may take place; see Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, p. 67, ss., and comp. p. 183, and *Dorner*, l. c. p. 258, ss. "*The incongruence between the historical and the ideal Christ is here indeed only hinted at in the most forbearing manner; but in point of fact this want of correspondence between the manifestation and the idea is a fundamental point in the Kantian philosophy;*" *Strauss*, ii. 292.

[5] *Zinzendorf* and the Society of the United Brethren. *Spangenberg* Idea Fidei Fratr. § 63–84. *Bengel*, comp. *Burk*, p. 353, ss., p. 541. [Comp. *Von der Goltz*, Die theologische Bedeutung Bengels und seiner Schule, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1861, pp. 460–507.] *Oetinger* (comp. Dorner, l. c. p. 305, ss.) *Haller*, *Gellert*, *J. C. Lavater*, *Hamann* (*Dorner*, p. 305), *Stilling*, *Claudius*, *Klopstock*, *Novalis* (*Dorner*, p. 323, ss.) Respecting Lavater, see the biographies by *Herbst*, *Gessner*, and others: *Hegner* (Beiträge, Lpz., 1836), p. 260, ss. "My grey hair shall not descend into the grave, until I have addressed these words to some of the elect: *He is more certain than I am*" (Handbibel, 1791). "*The divinity of Christ, this supreme power in heaven and on earth, was in all its aspects the only theme which he everywhere announced, taught in his writings, and treated at length;*" *Hegner*, p. 267. Comp. on the other hand, the remarkable letters of *Göthe* addressed to Lavater in the year 1781, pp. 140, 141.

[6] The christology of Swedenborg bears close resemblance to that of Swenckfeld. Jesus is born of the Holy Ghost and of Mary. Inasmuch as his divinity is the divinity of the Father, his body was also divine. That which was human was made divine by sufferings and temptations. The human which he received from Mary was gradually laid aside, and the heavenly divine body substituted for it. It is the divine body which he took with him to heaven. (Comp. his views concerning the Trinity, § 292; Dorner, p. 208, note.)—On *Oetinger's* Christology, see "Theologie aus der Idee des Lebens," p. 245, *sq.*; *Auberlen*, pp. 152, 163, 231, 239, *sq.*, and other passages.

[7] *Röhr*, Briefe über den Rationalismus, xi., and Christologische Predigten, Weimar, 1831. *Wegscheider*, Institutiones, § 123, 128. *Paulus*, das Leben Jesu.—*Dorner*, l. c. pp. 278, 279. (Rationalists speak only of a doctrina Christi, but not of a doctrina de Christo.)—On the controversy respecting the adoration of Christ, which was carried on in Magdeburg in the year 1840, see *Hase*, Church History, New York ed., p. 565.

[8] On the origin of these speculative views of Christ's nature as traced to the works of Spinoza, see *Strauss*, ii. p. 199.—*Fichte* (Anweisung zum seligen Leben, p. 166, ss,) makes a distinction between the absolute and the empirical point of view. From the absolute point of view the eternal word

becomes, at all times, and in every one, flesh, in the same manner in which it became flesh in Christ, and manifests itself to every man who has a clear view of his unity with God. Fichte, indeed, admits that the knowledge of the absolute unity of the human existence with the divine (the profoundest knowledge to which man can attain), had not existed previous to the time of Christ; but he also imagines that the philosopher may not only discover these truths independently of Christianity, but also take a more comprehensive and clearer view of them, than has been transmitted by Christianity. On the one hand he professes to believe (p. 172) that all truly rational men will, to the end of time, render profound homage to this Jesus of Nazareth, and acknowledge the incomparable excellency of this highly exalted person with the greater humility the more they know themselves; though he also thinks (p. 172) that if Jesus were to return to our world, he would rest satisfied at finding Christianity established in the minds of men, without claiming adoration for himself. But on the other hand (p. 173), he maintains that it is the *metaphysical* alone, and not the *historical*, which will save a man (the latter only makes the thing intelligible). "If any one be truly united with God, it is *altogether indifferent* in what manner he has attained unto this state, and it would be a most useless and perverse occupation to waste much time in the recollection of the manner, instead of enjoying that union itself." —*Schelling*, Methode des akademischen Studiums, p. 175: "The highest sense for religion which expressed itself in Christian mysticism, regarded the mystery of *nature*, and that of *the incarnation of God*, as identical." Ibid., p. 192: "Theologians interpret the incarnation of God in Christ empirically, as if God assumed the nature of man at a certain moment of time. But it is impossible to attach any meaning to this idea, since God is eternally aloof from all time. Hence the incarnation of God is an *incarnation from eternity*. The man Christ forms in his historical appearance only the crown, and therefore also the beginning of that incarnation; for beginning with him, it was so to be continued that all his followers should be members of one and the same body of which he is the head. History testifies that God truly manifested himself *first* in Christ: for who that preceded him revealed the infinite in such a manner?" On the other hand, comp. pp. 194, 195, where he maintains that the numerous incarnations in which the East Indians believe, are more rational than the single incarnation of God taught by Christian missionaries; and p. 206: "Whether the writings of the New Testament are genuine or not, whether the narratives contained in them are real and unadulterated facts, and whether their contents are in accordance with the idea of Christianity, or not, cannot affect the reality of that idea, inasmuch as it does not depend on *this single phenomenon*, but is universal and absolute." For further particulars, comp. *Dorner*, p. 339 ss.—*Blasche* (Ueber das Böse, p. 300) regards the matter rather from the historical point of view: ...."Christ is the representative of the acme to which the world-historical work of redemption had attained. The incarnation of God was completed in him. He has therefore the significance of a *personal moral creator of the world*" (p. 301). "He was the highest product of the universal moral creation in the history of the world; this higher creation became personal particularly in him" (p. 303).—Concerning the christological views of Hegel

(Religions Philosophie, vol. ii., p. 204 ss., especially p. 233–256), see *Dorner*, l. c., p. 397 ss., and his remarks respecting them, p. 406 ss. According to Dorner it is difficult to decide whether the historical Christ (in the system of Hegel) possesses any specific dignity,* or whether Hegel does not believe in the unity of the divine with the human in the person of Christ, merely as a means of comprehending it in himself? (*Dorner*, p. 414.) The adherents of the two schools of Hegel differ in their views concerning the nature of Christ. Some (as *Marheincke*, *Rosenkranz*, and *Conradi*, see *Dorner*, p. 366 ss.) endeavor to unite the *historical Christ* with the *ideal*. Others do not consider him as a purely mythical person, but as the accidental representative of a certain idea; this idea gave rise to the development of a body of myths, which were thrown around the name and person of Jesus. Thus *Strauss*, in his Leben Jesu, and in his Dogmatik, ii., p. 209 ss.†

[*] *De Wette* (comp. *Dorner*, p. 281 ss., who classes him with Fichte and Jacobi, but he ought rather to be compared with *Herder*), is not to be confounded with those who, rejecting the historical, attach importance only to the idea. On the contrary, he regards the *historical Christ* as the realized idea; although it must be confessed, his eye is rather turned toward the aspiring, subjective heart, seeking what may satisfy its wants, than to the investigating and argumentative intellect. He combats the mythico-speculative theory in decided terms; Religion und Theologie, p. 184. He was also the first who again treated Christian ethics (which orthodox theologians had been accustomed to discuss in the most abstract manner), on the foundation of the person of Christ; comp. his Lehrbuch der christlichen Sittenlehre, § 41 ss., § 53. See also his Vorlesungen über die Religion, Vorlesung 18: "All the rays of truth which came forth among men, are united in Christ, the light of the world. All the knowledge of the true and the good previous to his time is only a presentiment of that which he has revealed." Ibid., p. 444: "The *personal character*, life and death of Christ, and belief in him, form the *centre of Christianity*. The spirit of religion became personal in him, and, proceeding from him, exerted an influence upon the world which stood in need of a new religious life in order to regenerate it." Comp. his Kirchliche Dogmatik, § 63; Religion und Theologie, p. 115 ss.; Vorwurt zum Commentar des Matthaeus (1 edit., p. vii.); and the last chapter of his historical review of the narratives of the gospels (on John); the two latter are written

* Hegel rejected the rationalistic theory, p. 240: "If we regard Christ in the same light as Socrates, we regard him as a mere man, like the Mohammedans, who consider Christ to have been a messenger of God, in that more comprehensive sense in which all great men may be called ambassadors or messengers of God. If we merely say that Christ was a teacher of mankind, and a martyr for truth, we express ourselves neither from the Christian point of view, nor from that of true religion."—But compare what follows.

† However much *Jacobi* differed from the speculative philosophers on theological points, he was equally indifferent as to the historical person of the Redeemer, and rested satisfied with subjective religious feelings, while they contented themselves with the speculative idea. See the words addressed to Claudius, in the introduction to this treatise: Von den göttlichen Dingen (reprinted in *Strauss*, Dogmatik, ii., p. 203). In this *Herder* forms a partial contrast with *Jacobi*, or rather a complement to him (as Jacobi writes to Claudius, so does *Göthe* to Lavater, only in stronger terms; see note 5.)

in opposition to Strauss.—*Schleiermacher* has treated this doctrine in a more dialectic manner, and thus "exerted more influence than any other modern theologian upon his contemporaries;" (*Dorner*, p. 488 ss). But at the same time, he has given rise to new doubts (Strauss, Dogmatik, ii., p. 180 ss.) Compare his Weihnachtsfeier; der Christliche Glaube, ii. § 92–105; Reden über die Religion, 1829; Sendschreiben an Lücke (Studien und Kritiken, 1829, parts 2 and 3); several of his sermons; and the representations of his system given by Dorner and Strauss, l. c. Schleiermacher (like De Wette) differs from the adherents of the speculative school in rejecting the notion of an *ideal* Christ apart from the *historical* Christ. The historical and the ideal (he substituted these terms for those of human and divine nature), are, in his opinion, united in Christ. The ideal does not consist in skill and dexterity in particular departments of life, but in the purity and vigor of the innate consciousness of God. Schleiermacher rests faith in the divine authority of Christ on the idea of his sinlessness, and in connection with it, on the impossibility of his having erred. The church, as well as every believer, possesses the consciousness of this (an inference from the effect to to the cause). Christ came into existence—(viz. in his human nature) without sin. This generation does not necessarily exclude the idea of participation on the part of man, but is still to be regarded as a supernatural event, which does not stand in connection with what is sinful, but is a new creation. In opposition to *Strauss*, who asserts that the divine love could not have been wholly expended upon *one* individual, *Ullmann*, *Schweizer*, and others have carried the question back to the *religious* point of view, from which alone Schleiermacher proceeded. Others have endeavored, on speculative grounds, to determine the relation of the individual to the genus, and thus revived the old scholastic controversy (concerning Nominalism and Realism).—*Hase* agrees with Schleiermacher in maintaining (in opposition to the orthodox ecclesiastical, as well as the historical theory), that the divinity in Christ consisted in his blameless piety (Dogmatik, pp. 286, 287), and connects with this the idea, that after the example of Christ, every son of man, as far as is possible for him, ought to develope himself as a son of God, and every man to a God-man. Comp. *Dorner*, pp. 289 ss.

[10] The orthodox doctrine of the church has again found defenders in modern times with various modifications; see *Steffens*, von der falschen Theologie, p. 127. *Sartorius*, die Lehre von Christi Person und Werk, Hamb., 1831, '34, [transl. by *Stearns*, Boston].—*Schleiermacher* limited the specific difference between Christ and other men to his sinlessness—an idea brought out in its sharpest light by *Ullmann*, in his Sündlosigkeit Jesu, Hamb., 5te. Aufl., 1846 [transl. by Prof E. A. Park in German Selections, Andov., 1830, pp. 388–452]. In contrast with this preponderance of the authropological method of constructing the person of Christ, the metaphysical and theological method has been revived and enforced, in the interest of the orthodox doctrine of the church. Besides *Dorner's* Christology, see in particular *Liebner's* Christology, 1849, p. 12 sq. [Liebner's view is that of the necessity of the incarnation—presupposing creation as a free act—as the essential basis of Christianity, and the clue to all its mysteries.] See also *Ebrard*, Die Gottmenschlichkeit des Christenthums, Zürich, 1844; and his Dogma-

tik, ii. 1 sq. *Lange* Dogmatik, ii. 109 sq.: "*The idea of the God-man is the concentration of all knowledge of the divine in the human, and of the human in the divine, consequently the source of a truly divine, human life—hence it is the really fundamental idea of life.*" See also *Rothe*, Ethik, ii., p. 279 sq. [When the necessary historical conditions were fulfilled, God, re-adopting as it were the fallen creation, by a creative act brought the second Adam into union with the old, natural humanity—in a supernatural way—not by the forces contained in the race, but an immediate and absolute creative energy.] According to *Martensen*, p. 221; "the Son has his life, not merely in the Father, but also in the world." "As the heart of the Father, he is also the heart of the world;" hence the significance of his pre-existence. *W. F. Gess*, in his Lehre der Person Christi, Basel, 1856 (partly in opposition to Liebner, Thomasius and Dorner), has made a new attempt to develope the Christology "from the self-consciousness of Christ, and the testimony of the apostles."—On the Christology of Thomasius (Christi Person und Werk), see the Zeitschrift of Kliefoth and Mejer, iv. [See on the general subject, *Liebner*, Christologisches—a review of recent speculations, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1858. *W. Beyschlag*, Die Paulinische Christologie, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1860 (against the *Kenosis*). *J. Bodemeyer*, Die Lehre von der Kenosis, Götting., 1860: comp. his criticism of Richter's representation of the Lutheran Doctrine, in the Deutsche Zeitschrift, 1861, p. 60 sq. *Dorner's* articles on the Unveränderlichkeit Gottes (proposing a revision of the doctrine of the divine immutability, in its relations to Christology), bear upon the same speculations; see Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1856. *Weizsäcker*, Das Selbstzeugniss des johanneischen Christus, in the same journal, 1857.—*R. W. Wilberforce*, Doctrine of the Incarnation in Relation to Mankind and the Church, 1850.]

[11] "In point of fact, we cannot look for a *restitutio in integrum* of any one of the earlier centuries of the church development, not even of the sixteenth century; but a higher prospect is held out to us. Nor can any new, merely sharpened onesidedness (or even several such points) be the end [of these christological inquiries], but rather a higher unity, after the large experience we have had in philosophy and theology:" Liebner, in the Preface to his Christology, p. 10.—"Our time has correctly declared the idea of the divine humanity to be the key to Protestant theology: its essential task must be, to grasp the two antagonisms of the divine and human in Christ as abolished and reconciled; and to find the root of its theology in the unity of the divine and human natures, as personally realized in Christ. That is, it is its office to grasp the historical Christ as being equally the *real ideal* Christ, and the ideal as also *historical*:" *Schenkel*, Wesen des Protestantismus, i. 357, sq. ["The key to the whole christology, as *Strauss* says, is this—that an idea is made the subject of the predicates, which the church has ascribed to Christ; not a Kantian, unreal idea, but a real idea—humanity as the God-man." "Christ is God and man, as every man is in idea: what has been ascribed to him specifically and specially has been (by the Hegelian philosophy) resolved into the general essence of humanity." *Baur*, Dogmengeschichte, pp. 380–4.]

Menken (Homilien über das 9 und 10. Capitel des Briefs an die Hebräer, Bremen, 1831), and *Irving* (the Human Nature of Christ) revived the controversy, whether Christ assumed the human nature as it existed *prior*, or as it existed *posterior* to the fall? Menken and Irving maintained the latter. Irving was, on account of this assertion, excluded from the Scotch National Church. The subject in question also gave rise to discussions among the theologians belonging to the evangelical school of Geneva. See *Dorner*, Appendix, p. 530 ss.; *Baur*, Versöhnungslehre, p. 684; and *Preiswerk*, Lettre addressée à MM. les membres du Comité de la Société évangélique de Genève, 1837 (German and French); Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, xxi. p. 433 ss. [On *Menken*, see Leben u. Wirken, von *Dr. O. H. Gildemeister*, 2 Thle., 1860, and comp. *J. Müller's* review in Deutsche Zeitschrift, Jan., 1861, p. 24 sq. A new ed. of Menken's works, 1858–9; he was born at Bremen, May 29, 1768, died June, 1, 1831.]

The old scholastic inquiry, how far the incarnation was conditioned by the sin of Adam (see above, § 182. Note 2) has also been revived by the modern theology and investigated anew. See *Julius Müller*, (against *Dorner*), whether the Son of God would have become man, if the human race had remained sinless, in the Deutsche Zeitschrift f. Christl. Wissenschaft, 1850, No. 40–42 [also 1853. Comp. Flörke, Die Menschwerdung Gottes abgesehen von der Sünde, in Zeitschrift f. d. lutherische Theologie, 1854.—In England Trench has advocated the view of an incarnation even without the fall. See The Theory of an Incarnation without a Fall, in the British and Foreign Evangelical Review, Jan., 1861.]

§ 300.

THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

Baur, Lehre von der Versohnung, p. 478 ss.

As the Pietists had, during the preceding period, lowered the juridical idea of satisfaction, so the doctrine of atonement was represented by *Zinzendorf* in its internal connection with the Christian life, as the essence of Christianity. At the same time he gave it a more sensuous aspect than it had, either in the theory of Anselm, or in the theological system of the old Lutherans, but which was implied in the phraseology of the mystics.[1] On the other hand, *Conrad Dippel* and *Swedenborg* rejected, on the basis of a free, critical mysticism, the ecclesiastical doctrine of satisfaction altogether.[2] It was also attacked by the rationalist. After *Töllner* had called forth a spirit of inquiry in other directions, and also by combating the received doctrine of the active obedience of Christ (in opposition to *Ch. W. F. Walch*),[3] the entire host of those who advocated the so-called enlightenment of the age, opposed the church doctrine as unprofitable and dangerous to true morality.[4] Other theologians undertook its defence, some holding more, others less rigid opinions concerning it. Here too, *Kant* introduced a new series of discussions, by pointing out, in connection with his doctrine concerning original evil, the necessity of a restoration of the human nature; but he assigned only a symbolical and moral significance to the death of Christ.[6] The rationalists proper treated the subject from a more

negative point of view than Kant, losing sight of the symbolical in the merely moral.[7] On the other hand, *De Wette* brought the symbolical more prominently forward in peculiar aspects.[8] *Schleiermacher* connected the doctrine of the vicarious sufferings and perfect obedience of Christ, with his sinlessness and the doctrine of his priestly office, but separated between the substitution and the satisfaction, so as to represent Christ's sufferings alone as vicarious, but not as making satisfaction, and his obedience as making satisfaction, but not as vicarious.[9] The adherents of the speculative school regarded the death of the God-man as the abolition of his existence in a different mode of being from his primitive state [*das Aufheben des Andersseins*], and the necessary return of the life of God, that had assumed a finite form, into the sphere of the infinite.[10] Some of the strict supernaturalists, *Hasenkamp*, *Menken*, *Stier*, also found fault with the theory of Anselm, and endeavoured to substitute for it another scheme, which they thought more in accordance with the doctrine of Scripture.[11] But other theologians espoused the cause of Anselm, and, so far from rejecting his doctrine as useless, sought to develope it more fully in the same spirit.[12]

[1] Comp. 278. In opposition to Zinzendorf, *Bengel*, ubi supra, p. 81 ss, p. 89, expressed himself as follows: "The United Brethren attach almost exclusive importance to imagination, and care little about the understanding." P. 90: "Therefore they do not cease to talk of blood, wounds, the prints of the nails, the holes in his side, the smell of his corpse, etc., and frequently use the word lamb in an indiscreet manner. . Such images of scourges, the cross, etc., are calculated to produce an impression upon the natural senses and affections, especially in the case of the illiterate, but they constitute neither the whole thing, nor its principal part." P. 123: "He who knows the nature of the human mind, cannot approve of those who, in their thoughts and discourses, select one single article from among the whole treasure of wholesome doctrine, upon which they constantly dwell, and expect others to do the same. This leads to vain and insipid talk. By means of arbitrary, forced, and exaggerated meditations about the blood of Christ, they would fain bring us back to mere nature." P. 124: "If any one had a watch and should take away from it, piece by piece, the parts which he thinks may be dispensed with, because they do not point out the hour, the hand itself would soon become of no use to him. He that takes away all the parts of any thing destroys the whole. To take in pieces is to destroy." P. 126: "Many make of the blood of Christ an opium, by which they bring themselves and others into doubt as to what is right and wrong." [Comp. Von der Goltz, Bengel's Theologische Bedeutung in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol., 1861.]

[2] *Dippel* agreed with the mystics in regarding the internal life of Christ as containing the redeeming principle, in opposition to those who laid principal stress upon his external sufferings. In his view, the death of Christ is a type of that death which the old man must suffer in us. Christ did not deliver us from chastisements, but taught us how to bear them, that they

may serve to turn our minds from earthly things. Comp. *Walch*, Einleitung Religionsstreitigkeiten, ii. p. 718 ss., v. p. 998 ss. *Baur*, l. c., p 473 ss. Concerning the relation in which this doctrine stands to that of the Socinians, see also *Baur*, l. c.—According to *Swedenborg*, Christ's sufferings on the cross were the last temptation which he had to resist, in order to obtain the victory over the kingdom of Satan (*i. e.* hell); his human nature was, at the same time glorified by these sufferings, *i. e.* united with the divine nature of the Father. See Divine Revelation, i. p. 36 ss., and other passages.

[3] Comp. *Ch. G. F. Walch*, De Obedientia Christi activa Commentatio, Gött., 1755. *J. G. Töllner*, Der thätige Gehorsam Jesu Christi, Bresl., 1768: this treatise is to be compared with his Vermischte Aufsätze, ii. 2, p. 273, in which he defends the orthodox doctrine of Christ's *passive* obedience, and its practical utility, in opposition to Taylor and the Socinians. Comp. *Baur*, p. 478 ss. *Ernesti*, in the Neue Theologische Bibliothek, vol. ix., p. 914 ss. (this is rather about, than against Töllner). He also thinks that the distinction between obedientia activa et passiva, which is only calculated to produce confusion, ought long ago to have been given up; but "*people do not like to tune an instrument in a different key, lest the strings should break.*" He therefore undertakes to defend, at the sacrifice of philosophical exactitude, the assailed doctrine (p. 492). For further particulars, and the works in reply, see *Baur*, p. 504.

[4] *Steinbart*, *Eberhard*, *Bahrdt*, *Henke*, *Löffler*, and others; see *Baur*, p. 505–530.

[5] Among the advocates of the scriptural doctrine of redemption (but not of the theory of Anselm), *Herder* takes the most prominent place as regards truly spiritual views. (See his Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament, p. 51–56, and his Von Religion, Lehrmeinungen und Gebräuchen, Abhandlung 7: comp. also his Dogmatik, p. 212 ss.). Herder endeavored especially to maintain the religious aspect of this doctrine instead of the juridical; on the contrary, several modern advocates of the latter theory (*e. g. Michaëlis*, *Storr*, and partly also *Seiler*), adhered to the idea of Grotius, that the design of Christ's death was to set before us an example of punishment (comp. § 268, note 9), with which however they connected some other representations. Thus Storr supposed that the death of Christ exerted a reacting influence upon himself, by elevating him to a higher state of moral perfection: Von dem Zweck des Todes Jesu, p. 664, quoted by *Baur*, p. 544 ss.—*Döderlein*, *Morus*, *Knapp*, *Schwarz* and *Reinhard*,* regarded the death of

* All the various objects of Christ's death are surveyed in their connection by *Reinhard* with logical precision, § 107. He admits that this doctrine has been corrupted by numerous false additions, by which *thinking men* might be induced to regard it with suspicion; hence he does not approve of the opinion, that the wrath of God against sinful men rendered such a sacrifice necessary, and was, as it were, *only appeased by the blood of Christ.* He also rejects other ideas connected with the ecclesiastical doctrine and essential to its integrity. And at last he contents himself with the view, that the death of Christ was a *solemn declaration* that God will be merciful to sinners. "God thus appears as a *loving father*, who is willing to grant pardon to sinners, but also as a *just and wise father*, who, far from exhibiting any unseasonable and improper tenderness, will implant in the minds of the children whom he pardons, a most vivid aversion to their former sins, and teach them by an example [Grotius], the dreadful consequences that attend the violation of his laws, and the misery which they themselves have deserved."

Jesus as a solemn confirmation on the part of God of his willingness to pardon sin. Generally speaking these supernaturalists did not strictly adhere to the definitions of the symbolical books, and only admitted that which they thought could be proved by the plain words of Scripture. Nevertheless they did not wholly reject the theory of accommodation, especially as applied to God. See *Baur*, p. 547 ss.

[6] Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, p. 87 ss. According to Kant, man must, after all, deliver himself. A substitution, in the proper sense of that word, cannot take place. It is impossible that liabilities should be transmissible like debts (p. 88). Neither does the reformation of the heart pay off former debts. Thus man would still have to expect an infinite punishment on account of the infinite guilt which he has contracted. Nevertheless the extinction of guilt is possible. For inasmuch as, in consequence of the opposition (*antinomy*) existing between moral perfection and external happiness, he who amends his conduct has to undergo the same sufferings as he who perseveres in his evil course, and the *former* bears those sufferings with a worthy heart for the sake of virtue, he willingly submits to them as the punishment due the old man for his former sins. In a physical aspect he continues the same man, but in a moral aspect, he has become a a new man; thus the latter suffers in the room of the former. But that which thus takes place in man himself, as an internal act, is manifested in the person of Christ (the Son of God) in a visible manner, as the personified idea; that which the new man takes upon himself, while the old man is dying, is represented in this representative of mankind as the death which he suffered once for all (comp. p. 89 ss.). Nor can, in the opinion of Kant, any external expiation (not even that of the Son of God as our ideal representative) supply the lack of our own self-improvement (p. 96 and 163).—Concerning those theologians who adopted the principles of Kant, such as *Tieftrunk*, (*Süsskind*), *Staüdlin*, *Ammon*, and others, see *Baur*, l. c.—The theory of Kant was modified by *Krug*, in his Widerstreit der Vernunft mit sich selbst, in der Versöhnungslehre dargestellt und aufgelöst, Züllichau, 1802, (Gesammelte Schriften, i. Abtheilung: Theologische Schriften, vol. i., 1830, p. 295 ss.). See *Baur*, p. 589 ss.

[7] *Wegscheider*, p. iii., c. ii., § 142, reduces the design of Christ's death to this: Per religionis doctrinam a Christo propositam et ipsius morte sancitam hominibus, dummodo illius præceptis omni, quo par est, studio obsequantur, veram monstrari viam et rationem, qua, repudiatis quibusvis sacrificiis aliisque cærimoniis placandi numinis divina caussa institutis, vero Dei ejusque præceptorum amore ducti Deo probari possint. *Attamen* (continues he) *ne* animis fortioribus bene consulendo *imbecilliores offendamus*, sententiam de morte Jesu Christi expiatoria, ipsorum scriptorum ss. exemplo, *etiam symbolica quadam ratione* adumbrare licebit, ita ut mors Christi proponatur vel tamquam symbolum, quo sacrificia qualicunque sublata sint, ac reconciliatio hominis cum Deo significata et venia peccatorum cuivis vere emendato solemni ritu confirmata, etc. He uses very strong language in opposition to the ecclesiastical doctrine (which he caricatures): Omnino vero doctores caveant, ne conscientiæ improborum, imprimis morti propinquorum, quasi veternum obducant nimium jactando vim sanguinis Christi expiatoriam, quo

Deus Molochi instar, piaculi innocentis quippe sanguinem sitientis, placatus sistatur. (Comp. *Bengel*, above, note 1, and *Reinhard*, note 5). On the rational supernaturalistic theory of *Schott* and *Bretschneider*, comp. *Baur*, p. 608 ss.

[8] In his Commentatio de Morte Christi expiatoria, Berol., 1813 (reprinted in his Opuscula, Berol., 1830). The views propounded in that treatise are completed and corrected in the latter writings of De Wette (comp. the preface to his Opuscula). Religion und Theologie, p. 253: "We do not think like many modern theologians, that the doctrine of atonement is a useless or even pernicious remnant of Judaism in Christianity.... we regard it (as grasped by the feelings) as an *æsthetic religious symbol* which exerts the most beneficial influence upon the *pious mind*. The consciousness of guilt is the religious sentiment of submission, by which we humble ourselves before God, and through which we obtain peace. As all ideas have their historical and personal manifestation in Christ, so too this idea of redemption, which surpasses all others, in order that the entire life of mankind might be reflected in him.... In the death of Christ, which is the greatest proof of his love, we see displayed both the magnitude of our depravity, and the victory over it." Comp. his Dogmatik, § 73, *a* and *b*. The symbolical interpretation of Christ's death adopted by De Wette differs from that of Kant (and Wegscheider), in addressing itself to the *feelings* of man, and thus making the appropriation of that event a necessary act on the part of every one, inasmuch as religion itself has its root in those feelings. On the other hand Kant regarded the death of Christ as a symbol designed to assist the *understanding* (as a needful aid for those who require a symbolical representation of abstract ideas).

[9] According to *Schleiermacher*, the redeeming and atoning principle is not the single fact that Christ died, but a vital union with him. (In this union he recognizes a mystical element, which he distinguishes from the magical as well as the empirical, assigning to it an intermediate place.) By means of *this vital union* we appropriate to ourselves Christ's righteousness (his obedience unto death);* this appropriation, however, is not to be confounded with the mere external theory of vicarious satisfaction. But inasmuch as this single being represents the totality of believers, he may be rather called our *satisfaction-making substitute*. Comp. his Christlicher Glaube, ii. p. 103, ss., p. 128, ss. *Baur*, 614, ss. [According to *Schleiermacher* our reconciliation consists in our reception into the common life of Christianity, and sharing its common spirit. But since this life exists only in the finite form of an historical process, there is no absolute reconciliation, no unity with God. *Baur*, Dogmengesch., 287.] In opposition to Schleiermacher, *Steudel* defended the orthodox doctrine, see *Baur*, p. 642.—*Nitzsch*, following Schleiermacher, endeavored (System der christlichen Lehre, p. 238–248), to assign a more definite significance to Christ's passive obedience, which in the opinion of Schleiermacher, is only the crown of his active obedience. He made a distinction between reconciliation and expiation (καταλλαγή and ἱλασμός).

* Schleiermacher rejected the phrase that Christ fulfilled the *law;* he only fulfilled the *Divine will*, p. 134–136.

[10] *Fichte*, Anweisung zum seligen Leben, especially the fifth Lecture, p. 124, ss.; the ninth and tenth, p. 251, ss. *Baur*, p. 691, ss. *Schelling*, Methode des akademischen Studiums, § 299, note 8). Comp. *Blasche*, das Böse; etc., p. 304, ss. *Hegel*, Religionsphilosophie, Vol. ii. p. 246, ss., p. 249: "God is dead: this is the most dreadful idea, that all that is eternal, all that is true, is no more—that the negation itself is in God; the highest sorrow, the consciousness of perfect inability to help oneself, the giving up of all that is higher, is connected with this idea. But the process does not stop here; on the contrary, a change takes place—viz., God preserves himself in this process, which thus becomes the *death of death*. God rises again to life, and thus turns to the opposite."....P. 251: "It is infinite love, that God identifies himself with that which is foreign to him, in order to destroy it. This is the import of Christ's death." P. 253: "The phrase: *God himself is dead*, occurs in a Lutheran hymn; this means, that the human, the finite, the frail, the negative, itself contains a divine principle, is in God himself; that the being-Another [*das Andersein*], the finite, the negative, is not without God, does not prevent the unity with God," etc.—[What in Schleiermacher takes place only within the sphere of consciousness and history, becomes in Hegel the absolute process of God, or of the spirit. It is presupposed, that the antagonism in itself is abolished. This is what makes up the whole historic course of the Godman. In him, as in an individual, is represented what belongs to the very nature of God or of the spirit, viz., that it must become external to itself, become another, become nature, be individualised; and also be one (united) with itself, in this diremtion. The transient, external history of the Godman, his death and resurrection must be spiritualized, as the process of the finite spirit subduing the limits and frailties of its natural existence, and reconciling itself with its real nature. *Baur*, Dogmengeschichte, pp. 387–8.] Comp. *Baur*, l. c. p. 712, ss., and his Christliche Gnosis, p. 671, ss.—*Daub*, Theologumena (quoted by Baur, p. 696, ss.): "The world cannot by itself render satisfaction to God; God alone possesses a nature which can make satisfaction, or reconcile. As God, rendering satisfaction to God, he is the Son; as he to whom satisfaction is made, the Father; but both are in themselves One; the atonement belongs to the nature of God, and is as eternal as the creation and preservation. God from eternity sacrifices himself for the world; or, God the Father commands God the Son to sacrifice himself for him, and make satisfaction to him. Accordingly, inasmuch as God making satisfaction puts himself in place of the world, this satisfaction is vicarious, and active as well as passive. God making reconciliation elevates the world to absolute necessity, and is thus at the same time its creator and preserver, or the cause of its absolute reality and liberty."—*Marheineke*, Dogmatik, § 227–247 (quoted by *Baur*, p. 718, ss.): "By the reconciliation of the world with God through God, we understand that the Divine Being, one with himself and with the world, makes the transition through the corruption of the world, and destroys it. God, as the being who is from eternity sufficient to himself, is also the being who from eternity makes satisfaction to himself. But God can make satisfaction only as God-man, in whom reconciliation is possible, inasmuch as his human nature is not essentially different from the

Divine. The satisfaction made by the God-man is vicarious, since he, in making reconciliation, represents the world. This implies a twofold statement; first, that the world, in its state of corruption, cannot make satisfaction to God; and, secondly, that the world, in its truth and reality, as human nature, or in its true and holy principle, is represented by the person of the One Man who is the representative of all men, and thus the universal man, though he be but one individual"—*Usteri*, Paulinischer Lehrbegriff, p. 133: "The incarnation of the Son of God, who is begotten of the original ground of all things (the Father), is the reconciliation of the finite with the infinite, the created with the primal ground of being, the temporal with the eternal. The incarnate Son of God, by his death, returns from the sphere of the finite, created, and temporal, to that of the infinite, uncreated, and eternal, as the Spirit which is now reigning in the finite, and unites it eternally with God."

[11] *Klaiber* (quoted by *Baur*, p. 648), and especially *Hasenkamp*, (both the father and the son), *Menken* (a pastor in Bremen), *Collenbusch* in Barmen, and *Rudolph Stier*. All these agreed in rejecting the idea of a conflict between the love and justice of God (Hasenkamp and Menken, in particular, expressed themselves in strong language on this point); and in regarding the divine love as the true principle of redemption, but differed on some minor points (*e. g.* Stier retains the idea of the divine wrath.) For further particulars see *Baur*, p. 656 ss., where the literature is also given. Comp. *Krug*, Die Lehre des Dr. Collenbusch, Elberfeld, 1846, p. 44.

[12] To this class belong the author of an essay published in the Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, 1834; Geschichtliches aus der Versöhnungs- und Genugthuungslehre (see *Baur*, p. 672 ss. and *Göschel*, Zerstreute Blätter aus den Hand- und Hülfsacten eines Juristen, etc.); the latter especially defended the juridical aspect of the doctrine in question, which had given offence to many others. Comp. Tholuck's literarischer Anzeiger, 1833, p. 69, ss.; Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, 1834, p. 14; *Baur*, p. 682 ss.—The controversy has entered into a new phase, in the Lutheran Church, in consequence of the positions taken by *Hofmann* of Erlangen, in his Schriftbeweis, and in the Zeitschrift für Protest. und Kirche, March, 1856—deviating from strict orthodoxy in respect to "the vicarious satisfaction." *Philippi* replied in the preface to the second edition of his commentary to the Romans; and in the tractate, "Herr Dr. Hofmann gegenüber der lutherischen Versöhnungs- und Rechtfertigungslehre," Frankf., 1856; and *Schmid* in his "Dr. von H's., Lehre von der Versöhnung," Nördl., 1856. In rejoinder *Hofmann*, Schutzschriften für eine neue Weise, alte Wahrheit zu lehren, Nördl., 1856. [Four Parts, 1856–9.] Comp. *Ebrard* in the Allgem. Kirchenzeitung, Oct. 1856. [See also *Ebrard*, Die Lehre von der stellvertretenden Genugthung in der heiligen Schrift begründet, Konigsb., 1857. *G. Thomasius*, Das Bekenntniss der lutherischen Kirche von der Versöhnung, und die Versöhnungslehre Dr. C. K. von Hofmann's. Mit einen Vorwort von Dr. Th. Harnack, Erlangen, 1857. *Delitzsch* in the Appendix to his commentary on Epistle to Hebrews. *Bodemeyer*, Zur Lehre d. Versöhnung, 1858. The Vorwort to the Evang. Kirchenzeitung, 1858, against Hofmann. *Gess*, Zur Lehre d. Versöhnung, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol., 1858, pp. 713–788, on An

selm's doctrine, etc. *A. Schweizer*, Lehre des Paulus vom erlösenden Tode, etc., in Stud. und Kritiken, 1858; and *Baur* in reply, in Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol., 1859. *Weizsäcker* gave a review of the recent controversy in his article, Um was handelt es sich in dem Streite über die Versöhnungslehre, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol., 1858, pp. 114–188. *Schneider*, The Lutheran Doctrine of Christ's Vicarious Death, transl. in Brit. and Foreign Evang. Review, 1861, from the Studien und Kritiken, 1860.]

[In several recent English works, the life-theory is advocated, in distinction from the satisfaction-theory: *e. g.* by *Maurice* (Doct. of Sacrifice, 1854), reply by *Candlish* of Edinb.; *John McLeod Campbell*, The Nature of the Atonement, Camb., 1826; *Jas. B. Brown*, The Divine Life in Man; *Henry Solly*, Doctrine of Atonement by the Son of God, 1861. Comp. also *William Thomson*, The Atoning Work of Christ; the Bampton Lectures, for 1853. *E. Mellor*, The Atonement, its Relation to Pardon, 2d ed., 1860. *J. C. Macdonnell*, Six Discourses on Doctrine of Atonement (Univ. Dublin), 1858. *A. Robertson*, Hist. of the Atonement Controversy in connection with the Secession Church (Scotland: Morisonianism). On the controversies in the United States, see above, § 285, *d*, *e*. Comp. also *Albert Barnes*, The Atonement in Relation to Law and Moral Government, 1859. *Shedd*, The Atonement a Satisfaction for the Ethical Nature of both God and Man, Bib. Sacra, 1860.—On the extent of the Atonement, see *Richards'* Lectures (1846), pp. 302–328; and Princeton Rev., 1856.—*Bushnell's* views in his God in Christ (1849), pp. 183–275, and Christ in Theology, 1851, 212, 330.]

The doctrine of the *Descensus ad inferos* was agreeable neither to the views of the rationalists, nor to the modern supernaturalists. The adherents of the speculative philosophy regarded it as a mere symbolical expression, to indicate that, even in the most corrupted souls, there is still one entrance for the gospel of Christ. Compare the passages from the works of *Reinhard*, *De Wette*, and *Marheineke*, collected by *Hase*, Dogmatik, p. 344.—The doctrine of the three offices of Christ was combated by *Ernesti*, in his Opuscula Theologica, p. 411 ss. Modern theologians (such as Schleiermacher) have revived it. Comp. *König*, Die Lehre von Christi Höllenfahrt, Frankf., 1842: and especially, *E. Güder*, Die Lehre von der Erscheinung Jesu Christi under den Todten, in ihrem Zusammenhange mit der Lehre von den letzten Dingen, Bern., 1853. [On Güder, see Zeitschrift f. die lutherische Theologie, 1857, p. 391 *sq.* *V. U. Maywahlen*, Tod, Todenreich, etc., Berl., 1854; transl., by *J. F. Schön*, Lond. 1856. *J. Körber*, Katholische Lehre von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi, Landshut, 1860. *Hölemann* in Bibel Studien, 1861, pp. 89–129.—*F. Huydekoper*, Belief of First Three Centuries on Christ's Mission to Underworld, Boston, 1854. The Intermediate State, by the late Duke of Manchester, Lond., 1856. *J. Munscher* in Bib. Sacra., 1859.]

§ 301

THE ECONOMY OF REDEMPTION. JUSTIFICATION AND SANCTIFICATION. (FAITH AND GOOD WORKS.) GRACE AND LIBERTY. PREDESTINATION.

The orthodox view of the doctrine of atonement having been abandoned, the juridical idea of justification, as distinctly separated from that of sanctification, also lost its significance, and Protestant

t' eologians manifested a leaning to the Roman Catholic doctrine, in r' garding both as different aspects of one and the same divine act.[1] I ant claimed for man the power of amending himself by his own p wer of will, nothwithstanding his theory of radical evil ;[2] but he r jected, in accordance with the essential principles of Protestantism, all external and legal righteousness by works, or any merit based on the same.[3] He also pointed out the importance of *faith*, but made a distinction between the statutory (historical) faith in the doctrines of the church, and the faith of religion (*i. e.* reason), and ascribed to the latter alone an influence upon morality.[4] The same was the case with the rationalists in general, who have sometimes been unjustly charged with giving countenance to the Roman Catholic doctrine of righteousness by works, in connection with their Pelagian tendencies. The Pietists and Methodists retained the strict views of Augustine, though with various modifications.[5] The adherents of the modern theology, too, have either defined the idea of liberty in the sense of Augustine rather than in that of Pelagius, or endeavored, from a higher point of view, to bring about a reconciliation between the two systems.[7] Thus too the Augustinian and Calvinistic doctrine of *predestination*,[8] despite the warning and threatening voice, which *Herder* had once raised against the hand that should again renew the strife,[9] was acutely defended by *Schleiermacher*, who endeavored to remove all its offensive aspects.[10] On the other hand, the advocates of its ruder form were led to pass a harsh and condemnatory sentence upon their opponents.[11] Modern theology in general has endeavored to overcome the harshness of the dogma, without giving up its deeper significancy.[13]

[1] *Henke* maintained that it is indifferent whether emendatio precedes, or the pacatio animi; Lineamenta, cxxiii. But such indifference could not last. More profound investigations contributed to bring about a higher union. *Schleiermacher*, Christliche Glaubenslehre, vol. ii. pp. 109, 110. *Marheineke*, Dogmatik, p. 301 : "The idea of justification must be defined in accordance with the spirit of Christian religion, as the union of the forgiveness of sins with the communication of love." Comp. also *Menken* and *Hahn* (quoted by *Möhler*, Symbolik, p. 151—in reference to the fides formata). *Hase*, Dogmatik, p 419–21. In modern times, however, the economy of redemption as propounded by earlier theologians has been again defended (in opposition to the Roman Catholic doctrine), in order to prevent its being refined away. See the work of *Baur*, in reply to Möhler, p. 235 ss. [The idea of faith, as merely receptive of God's declaration of the forgiveness of sins was not in accordance with the spirit of the times, which gave an intense significancy to self-consciousness. In proportion as faith, instead of being viewed as a mere form, received definite contents, as a self-active principle, the antagonism between faith and works, and between Protestantism and Catholicism, became weaker. . Kant gave prominence to the moral ideal personified in Christ, Schleiermacher to the participation in Christ's perfection, through

vital union with him; Hegel to the subjective assurance of a reconciliation objectively ensured, *i. e.* to man's knowledge of his oneness with the absolute spirit—for which Strauss substituted the concrete idea of humanity. *Baur*, Dogmengesch., 389–390.—In the Anglican literature, the works of *Davenant*, (1631), Bp. *Downam* (1633), and *O'Brien*, Bp. of Ossory (against *Bull*) defended the Protestant doctrine, modified in the teachings of *Bull*, *Waterland* and *Hooker*. The views of the Oxford School in *J. H. Newman's* Lects. on Justif., 1838. Comp. *Whately's* Errors of Romanism: *Heurtley's* Bampton Lectures, 1845: *McIlvaine's* Oxford Theology.—On the American discussions, see Princeton Essays, vol. i.; *Duffield* on *Finney*, in Bibl. Repos., 1845; *Boyd* in Presb. Quarterly, 1854; *Stearns* on Justification, 1853; *Albert Barnes*, How shall man be just with God? 1854; President *Lord's* Sermon on Justification, 1854. *George Junkin*, Treatise on Justif., 2d ed., 1850. See § 285, *d*, pp. 236, 244.]

[2] In his Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, p. 45: "That which man is in a moral aspect, *depends on his own exertions*. It must be the effect of his own free will, for otherwise he could not be responsible for it, and accordingly, would be neither morally good, nor morally bad. P. 46: Notwithstanding the fall, the command is given: We *must* be better men; hence we must be *able* to be so....At the same time it must be presupposed that a germ of good has remained in its original purity, that it could neither be destroyed nor corrupted; surely this germ cannot be self-love," etc. P. 53: "There is one thing in our soul, which, if we attentively examine, we cannot cease to consider with the highest wonder, a wonder which is not only legitimate, but also serves to elevate our souls. This one thing is *the original moral nature of man*"....P. 58: "According to moral religion (an appellation which, of all the public forms of religion, can alone be applied to Christianity), it is a fundamental principle that every one must use all possible efforts to become a new man" (Luke xix. 12–16). Comp. his Lehre vom *Kategorischen Imperativ* (in the Kritik der praktischen Vernunft).

[3] Ibid., p. 52: "The moral culture of man must not commence with the *amendment of his conduct*, but with a *complete change in his mode of thinking*, and with the *basis of his character*." (Comp. the distinction which he made between *legality* and *morality*, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft, p. 106.)

[4] Ibid., p. 157 ss. Of course by religion he understands the religion of reason, into which historical faith must gradually pass over (p. 169). Concerning divine grace (according to the principles of the Kantian philosophy), comp. *Tieftrunk*, iii., p. 132 ss.; concerning the effects of grace, see p. 166 ss. *By saving faith* he understands (p. 204), 1. That man *himself* does all he can in order to obtain salvation; 2. That he leaves the *remaining part* to the wisdom of God.

[5] *Bengel* bitterly complained of the Pelagian tendencies of his age; men had become increasingly strangers to the effects of grace, and that to such an extent, that Pelagius, if he could rise again in our day, would undoubtedly be dissatisfied with the present Pelagianism. See *Burk*, p. 238. The rationalists and the prosaic tendency of the age took offense principally at

the supernatural effects of grace: see *J. J. Spalding*, Ueber den Werth der Gefühle, 1764. *J. L. Z. Junkheim*, Von dem Uebernatürlichen in den Gnadenwirkungen. For further particulars see *Bretschneider*, Entwurf, p. 677 ss., and comp. *Wegscheider*, § 151 ss., especially § 161 (De unione mystica). The rationalists acknowledged no other practical Christianity than that which manifests itself in external actions, and for the most part misunderstood the true nature of mysticism, the dynamic in the doctrine concerning faith and its internal effects. On the other hand, the Christian rationalists (in distinction from the deists) always urged the importance of making the heart the source of our actions, and reject the lifeless works of the law; see *Wegscheider*, § 155, p. 542, in reference to the words of Luther: "Good and pious works never more make a good and pious man, but a good and pious man makes good works: the fruit does not bring forth the tree, but the tree brings forth the fruit." (*Walch*, xix., p. 1222 ss.) Comp. *Stäudlin*, Dogmatik, p. 417, and others, quoted by *Hase*, Dogmatik, p. 419.

[6] The differences obtaining among the pietists and Methodists had, for the most part, reference to the struggles of repentance, to the questions, whether grace may be lost or not, whether it is possible to attain moral perfection in this present life, to the unio mystica cum Deo, etc. Thus *Wesley* (1740) differed from the United Brethren in reference to the necessity of good works, and the various degrees of faith; see *Southey* (translated by *Krummacher*), i. p. 298, ss.—*Wesley* and *Whitefield* separated from each other, because the former asserted the universality of grace, while the latter advocated the particularistic theory; see ibid. p. 330, ss.—The Pietists charged the United Brethren with a want of zeal in the work of sanctification.—*Bengel* charged *Zinzendorf* with Antinomianism; Abriss der Brudergemeinde, p. 128, ss. In opposition to the doctrine of spiritual union (as the United Brethren understood it), he expressed himself as follows, p. 145: "This doctrine has the appearance of the greatest spirituality, but in reality it offers richer food to the flesh than any mere man of the world can attain unto." Comp. on the other side, Idea Fidei Fratrum, § 118, § 149, ss., § 169, ss.—According to *Swedenborg* (in opposition to the doctrine of the church, and to the Moravians), the imputation of the merit of Christ is a word without meaning, unless we understand by it the forgiveness of sins *after* repentance; for nothing belonging to the Lord can be *imputed* to man, but he (the Lord) can promise salvation after man has repented, *i. e.* after he has seen and acknowledged his sins, and if he afterwards, from love to the Lord, abstain from them. This condition being fulfilled, the promise of salvation is made to man in such a manner that man cannot be saved by his own merit or his own righteousness, but by the Lord, who alone has fought with and overcome hell, etc. See Divine Revelation, i. p. 47. Ibid.: "There is a *Divine* faith, and a *human* faith; those who repent possess Divine faith, but those who do not repent, and nevertheless believe in imputation, possess human faith."

[7] *De Wette* considered the subject in question in a twofold aspect, each of which may, in a certain sense, be justified—(viz. the religious, and the ethical aspect, that of faith and that of reason); see his Religion und Theologie, p. 242, ss. (comp. his Dogmatik, § 76, ss.). *Hegel* used the word

liberty in a higher sense (contrasted with the liberty of choice)—viz., as liberty which has its origin in union with God, so that in one respect all is grace, in another all is liberty, the actings of God appear ours, and vice versa: see his Philosophie der Religion, i. p. 157. *Hase*, Hutterus Redivivus, p. 274. For a further theological discussion, comp. *Schleiermacher*, Christliche Glaubenslehre, ii. § 86–93, § 106–112; *Nitzsch*, System der christlichen Lehre, p. 138, ss. [Comp. *Julius Müller*, Lehre von der Sünde, ii. 6–48 (on formal and real freedom), and 89–151 (transcendental and empirical freedom); see also his representation of Augustine's views, i. 45, *sq.*—*Kant's* views on freedom are reproduced in *Henry Solly*, The Will, Divine and Human, 1856 (comp. Am. Theol. Rev., 1860, p. 542).—On *Edwards* on the Will, and the American discussions, see § 285, *d.*]

[8] For a considerable time controversy respecting this doctrine had reposed. It was revived in the course of the eighteenth century by the work of *Joachim Lange*; Die evangelische Lehre von der allgemeinen Gnade, Halle, 1732. *J. J. Waldschmidt*, a pastor in Hesse, defended the Calvinistic doctrine in opposition to Lange, 1735. For the further progress of this controversy see *Schlegel*, Kirchengeschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts, ii. 1, p. 304; *Von Einem*, ii. p. 323.

[9] In his work: Vom Geist des Christenthums, p. 154 (Dogmatik, p. 234): "Fortunately our age has consigned to oblivion all these unscriptural and lifeless errors, as well as the entire controversy respecting various gifts, which was carried on in a most unchristian spirit, *and may the hand wither that shall ever bring it back!*" (Herder agreed with his contemporaries in their low estimate of Augustine and the doctrine concerning the workings of grace; for further passages comp. his Dogmatik, p. 230, ss.)

[10] In his essay: Ueber die Lehre von der Erwählung (Theologische Zeitschrift, herausgegeben von *Schleiermacher*, *De Wette*, und *Lücke*, part i. p. 1, ss.) On the other side: *De Wette*, Ueber die Lehre von der Erwählung, etc. (Theologische Zeitschrift, part ii. p. 83, ss.). *Bretschneider* (in the Oppositionsschrift von *Schröter* und *Klein*, iv. p. 1–83). *Schleiermacher*, Christliche Glaubenslehre, ii. § 117–120. The milder aspect which he gave to the doctrine in question consists in regarding election, not as referring to the lot of man after death, but to the earlier or later admission to fellowship with Christ. The literature is given by *Bretschneider*, Entwurf, p. 677, ss. [Schleiermacher's Essay on Election, transl. by *L. Woods*, in Lit. and Theol. Review.—Schleiermacher maintained the general Calvinistic doctrine, but "abolished its dualism by the idea of a universal world-organism, which for the completion of the race demands in the individual every grade of spiritual capacity; also looking to the conversion of all in a future life." *Strauss* says, that he brought the doctrine out of the theological sphere into the philosophical, and really made the question to be, whether there could be an independent human agency alongside of the supreme divine causality. See *Baur*, p. 392.—Comp. *Geo. Stanley*, Faber, Primitive doctrine of Election ("ecclesiastical individualism"), 2d ed. 1842. *J. B. Mozley*, Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination, Lond., 1855.]

[11] The views of *Abr. Booth* advanced in his work, The Reign of Grace (translated into German by *Krummacher*, Elberf., 1831), were combated by

J P. Lange, Lehre der heiligen Schrift von der freien und allgemeinen Gnade Gottes, ibid., 1831.—On the Methodist controversy see note 6 [and *Abel Stevens*, Hist. of Religious Movement, etc., New York, 1859. On the Methodist Controversy in America—*Fitch* and *Fisk*—see Calvinistic Controversy, New York, 1853.] The doctrine of Predestination has found in *Kohlbrügge* a new defender, among the Reformed.

[12] Comp. *e. g. J. P. Lange*, Dogmatik, ii. 956, *sq.*, *Martenson*, 338—polemical against Schleiermacher. *Ebrard*, i. 120, 339, 356, *sq.* ii. 688 *sq.* (making a distinction between the theological and the anthropological question). See also *E. W. Krummacher*, Des Dogma von der Gnadenwahl, Duisburg, 1856. [*Hebart*, Biblische Lehre von der Prädestination, in Zeitschrift f. d. lutherische Theologie, 1858.—The question has been discussed between *Schweizer* and *Ebrard* on the relation of the dogmatic system of the Reformed Church to necessarianism (determinism); the former represented this doctrine as the life of the Reformed system, in his Glaubenslehre d. Ref. Kirche, etc.; see *Ebrard*, Das Verhältniss d. ref. Dogmatik, etc., 1849; and *Schweizer* in in the Tübingen Zeitschrift, 1851.]

FOURTH DIVISION.

THE CHURCH. THE SACRAMENTS. ESCHATOLOGY.

§ 302.

THE DOCTRINES CONCERNING THE CHURCH.

As the spirit of worldliness gained ground, it could hardly be expected that a clear sense of the existence and functions of the Church would be retained. The perverted Protestantism of the so-called illumination period thought that every approach to an independent development of ecclesiastical life, in opposition to the state, had a hierarchical tendency. After the chancellor *Pfaff*, in Wirtemberg, had defended what is called the collegial system in opposition to the territorial system,[1] the latter was advocated by those who regarded the Church as an institution which the state may use for disciplinary purposes, or, who at the utmost, admitted the "utility of the ministry."[2] Considering the general want of ecclesiastical life, it cannot be a matter of surprise that a growing desire after Christian fellowship manifested itself among individuals, which led to the formation of smaller churches within the Church universal, such as the Society of the United Brethren.[3] Others, *e. g. Swedenborg*, despairing of the present, established the Church of the *New Jerusalem*, in the ideal world in which they lived.[4] *Kant* alone rose above the narrow-mindedness of the friends of such illumination, by directing attention once more to the importance and necessity of a society based upon moral principles, or the establishment of the kingdom of God upon earth.[5] But he rested satisfied with the merely moral aspect; while the true church can only be founded upon profound religious principles, which must have their origin in spiritual views of religion in general, and a more living Christology in particular. On this account modern theologians have come to discuss the doctrine concerning the Church even more fully than the reformers.[6] The development of the Canon Law, and of ecclesiastical government, kept pace with the development of the doctrine. On the one hand, church and state are entirely separated from each other, *e. g.*, in the United States of America[7] (attempted also in the

Canton de Vaud, and in Scotland); on the other hand, some speculative theologians have sought to bring about a higher union of both *in the state*,[8] others again take an intermediate position, asserting that church and state are distinguishable in idea, but practically must exert a living influence upon each other.[9]—*Puseyism* advanced with new vigor the claim of the Church of England to superiority, or account of the episcopal succession from the days of the apostles.[10] The *Irvingites* demanded a new apostolate, and the restitution of the offices of the apostolic church.[11] Even in the New-Lutheran church, the idea of *office* has been emphasized in such a way as to awaken anew the fear of a heirarchy, and to call out strong opposition.[12]

[1] *Pfaff* de Originibus Juris ecclesiastici variaque ejusdem indole. Tüb., 1719, 4to; in 1720, published with a new essay, De Successione Episcopali. The church is a society, a *collegium* which has its own laws and privileges. The rights which princes possess in ecclesiastical matters are conferred upon them by the church (silently or expressly?). See *Schröckh*, vii. p. 547, and *Stahl*, Kirchenrecht, p. 37, ss. On the other hand, the so-called territorial system first propounded by *Thomasius* (see § 256, note 4), was more fully developed by *Just Henning Böhmer* (died 1749) and others.

[2] See *Spalding*, Von der Natzbarkeit des Predigtamts. He was combated by *Herder*, in the Provinzialblätter.

[3] *Zinzendorf* did not intend to found a sect, but to establish an *ecclesiola in ecclesia;* see *Spangenberg*, Idea Fidei Fratrum, p. 542: "The United Brethren consider themselves *as a very small part of the visible church* of our Lord Jesus Christ....Since they hold the same doctrines as those of the Evangelical Church (set forth in the Confessio August.), they see no reason for separating from it....Those are right who regard the congregations of the United Brethren as institutions founded by our Lord Jesus Christ in his church, in order to present a barrier to the flood of corruption now breaking in upon doctrine and life. The opinion of those is well-founded who regard them as an hospital in which our Lord Jesus Christ, the only physician of our souls, has collected many of his poor and diseased followers to care for them, and that their wants may be supplied by his servants."

[4] Divine Revelation of Swedenborg, ii. p. 84: "The church is *in* man; the church which is without man, is a church composed of many in whom the church is."—The church is everywhere, where the word of God is rightly understood.—Swedenborg thinks that the church is everywhere typified in the old Testament. By the New Jerusalem spoken of in the book of Revelation he understands the new church as regards her doctrines (ibid., i., p. 132. The new doctrines hitherto concealed, but now revealed by Swedenborg, constitute the new church, or the church of the New Jerusalem, pp. 138, 139, and in several other places.

[5] In his Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft; third chap

ter, p. 119 ss., comp. the fourth chapter, concerning "Religion und Pfaffenthum," p. 211 ss.

[6] In common with the rationalists, the adherents of formal supernaturalism lost the more profound insight into the nature of the church. Thus *Reinhard*, treated of the church in a very external, desultory and negative manner, p. 614 ss. Comp. *Röhr*, Briefe über den Rationalismus, p. 409 ss. (quoted by *Hase*, Dogmatik, p. 455). *Wegscheider*, Institutiones, § 185 ss. gives better definitions.—*Schleiermacher* returned to that view, according to which the church is a living organism (the body of Christ), and he viewed it in connection with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, who is the spirit of fellowship; see his Christliche Glaubenslehre, i., § 6, p. 35–40, § 22, p. 125 ss., ii., § 121 ss., § 125, p. 306 ss. Comp. *De Wette*, Religion und Theologie, p. 167 ss.; Dogmatik, § 94. *Twesten*, i., p. 107 ss. *Nitzsch*, p. 306 ss.—The adherents of the speculative philosophy regard the church "as God existing in the congregation," or, "as the religious side of the state." But the Gnostic distinction which they make between those who believe and those who know, would naturally prevent them from forming any just idea of the church. See *Hegel*, Philosophie der Religion, ii., p. 257 ss. *Marheineke*, Dogmatik, p. 320 ss. *Strauss* (Dogmatik, ii., p. 616) further explains the Hegelian view, as implying that philosophers should not be compelled to belong to any particular church, but thinks it very strange, that separation from church-fellowship should be the result of a philosophical examination. Comp. *Biedermann*, Die freie Theologie, p. 201 sq.—More recent doctrinal statements concerning the church, see in *Lange*, Dogmatik, ii. 1081 sq.—According to him the church "is the planting and development of the salvation and life of Christ in the social sphere," and "the typical commencement of the world's transfiguration." On the polarity of the church, as cœtus Sanctorum, and mater fidelium, see *Ebrard*, 404 sq.; on its completion in the kingdom of Christ, ibid., 730 sq. [Separatism views the church only as the cœtus Sanctorum; its historical continuity is found in it as the mater fidelium.—The completion of the church will consist in the exclusion from it of all the wordly elements that remain, which can only be by a crisis. *Ebrard*, ubi supra.]—"*The Protestant church is a developing, but not a fully developed church; it is the church of the future.*" *Schenkel*, Protestantismus, iii. 202 sq.

[7] This independence of the church in relation to the state is connected with the independence of the citizens in relation to the church, and to ecclesiastical institutions, and with the liberty of worship. Comp. *Vinet*, Mémoire en Faveur de la Liberté des Cultes, Paris, 1826 (comp. *Hagenbach*, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1829, 2d part, p. 418).—On the Scotch National Church, and the disturbances in the Canton de Vaud, see *Niedner*, Kirchengeschichte, 886. [Comte *Agénor de Gasparin*, Intérêts généraux du Protestantisme Français, Paris, 1843.—On the Scotch Church, see § 285, *c.*]

[8] *R. Rothe*, die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verfassung. 2 vol., Wittenb., 1837–45, Ethik, ii. 89 sq., 145 sq.: "As long as the single national state has not completed its development as a state, the extent of the ethical communion of the people is not yet completely embraced in their religious fellowship; that is, the political body (the State) does not include and swal

low up the religious communions. In such a state of things there must of course be a church alongside of the state. *But the church as a distinct body, must also recede and be dissolved, just in proportion as the state approximates to the perfection of its development.*" [Comp. *Gladstone*, on Church and State: and § 285, *b*, p. 246. *H. W. Wilberforce*, Hist. of Erastianism, 1851. *R. J. Wilberforce*, Inquiry into Principles of Church Authority, Balt. ed., 1855. *Pusey* on Royal Supremacy, 1849. *J. R. Pretyman*, Church of England and Erastianism, 1854. Among English writers, *Coleridge* and *Arnold* approximate to the views of Röthe.]

[9] *F. J. Stahl*, die Kirchenverfassung nach Lehre und Recht der Protestanten, Erl., 1840. (Second Appendix.)

[10] See the statements of the Oxford divines in the work of *Weaver-Amthor*, p. 16 sq. *Hook*, Sermons on the Church Establishment: "The only office to which the Lord has pledged his presence is that of the bishops, the successors of the first commissioned Apostles, and to the rest of the clergy, so far as they are sanctioned by the bishops and act under their authority." *Keble* and *Newman*, in the Evangelical Magazine, p. 68: "The gift of the Holy Spirit is preserved to the world only by the episcopal succession; and to strive for communion with Christ by any other channel is to attempt what is impossible." [On the Oxford School, see above, pp. 423, 426.]

[11] They call themselves the Catholic Apostolic Church. Their offices are those of apostles, prophets, evangelists, shepherds and teachers. See Narrative of Events, affecting the Position and Prospects of the whole Christian Church, Lond., 1847. *W. H. Darby*, The Irvingites—in German by *Poseck*, Berl., 1850. A short sketch by *Stockmeier*, Irvingismus, Basel, 1850. [See above, § 285, note 6, p. 414.]

[12] *Löhe*, Kirche und Amt., Erlangen, 1851. *Münchmeier*, Sichtbare und unsichtbare Kirche, 1855. *Klieforth*, Acht Bücher von der Kirche, Schwerin, 1854. *Harless*, Kirche und Amt., Stuttg., 1853. *C. Lechler*, Neutest. Lehre vom heiligen Amte, Stuttg., 1857. *W. Preger*, Die Geschichte vom geistlichen Amte, auf Grund der Rechtfertigungslehre, Nördling., 1857. See *Palmer's* article, *Geistliche*, in Herzog's Realencyclop. [*Delitzsch*, Vier Bücher von d. Kirche, 1847. *Julius Müller*, Die unsichtbare Kirche, in Deutsche Zeitschrift, 1851. *Hodge*, in Princeton Review, 1853.]

Several questions of a more practical nature, *e. g.* those concerning the rights of princes in matters of worship, the constitution of Synods, the presbyterian form of church government, the obligation of ministers to sign the symbolical books of the church to which they belong, the relation of the various denominations to each other, etc., have frequently been discussed in modern times. See the acts of the General Synod, held at Berlin, 1846: the 18th and following sessions.

In the *Roman Catholic* church a controversy was carried on between the Curialists and Episcopalians. Jansenism made its appearance in Germany as Febronianism (see *Klee*, Dogmengeschichte, i., p. 99). The French Revolution seemed to have annihilated the existence of the Church; but it rose again with new vigor. Concerning its further development and the various politico-ecclesiastical systems, see the works on ecclesiastical history and Canon Law. Respecting the conflicts to which the subject of mixed marriages, etc., gave rise, see ibid.

§ 303.

THE MEANS OF GRACE.* THE SACRAMENTS.

Protestants continue to hold the doctrine of two sacraments'—viz. *Baptism* and *the Lord's Supper*. The denominational differences between the Lutherans and the Calvinists, to which the doctrine of the Lord's Supper had given rise, were still in existence at the commencement of the present period.[2] But the position of the Socinians, that the sacraments are mere ceremonies, being in better accordance with the tendency of rationalism,[3] the Lutheran theologians gradually abandoned their former rigid views,[4] so that, at last, the denominational differences were lost sight of, in consequence of the wider spread of indifferentism. Those only who had retained some idea of grace, continued to attach importance to the *means of grace*.[5] The rationalists adopted in the main, the theory of Zwingle.[6] Calvinism was more fully developed by the adherents of a mediating theology in particular, and served as the basis of the ecclesiastical union.[7] The old Lutheran view, however, was also revived in its most rigid form, and adopted by many ;[8] this was still more the case as modern philosophers interpreted it speculatively.[9] Anabaptist views concerning baptism have given rise to controversies in our own day.[10] Inasmuch as the more unprejudiced of the Protestant theologians gradually admitted that infant baptism was not expressly commanded in Scripture, *Schleiermacher* and his followers endeavored to defend the ecclesiastical usage, by regarding the *act of confirmation* as a complement of that of baptism.[11] The strict Lutherans still hold to the objective significancy of the sacrament of baptism in its full extent.[12] The Puseyites make the connection between spiritual regeneration and water baptism to be essential.[13]

[1] *Augusti* gave the preference to the threefold division into baptism, the Lord's Supper, and absolution, which he compared (an anti-climax) to the Trinity—(viz. baptism is the sacrament of the Holy Spirit, the Lord's Supper is that of the Son, and absolution is that of the Father as the supreme judge). See his System der christlichen Dogmatik, 2d edit., p. 278–281, Preface, p. 6; and his Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, p. 382. *Karrer* agreed with him (*Bertholt's* Kritisches Journal, xii). *Ammon* (Summa Doctrinæ, edit. iii., p. 251) would like to number, if it were suitable, the redditio animæ in manus Domini, among the sacraments; and *Kaiser* (Monogrammata, p. 224) held that confirmation and the laying on of hands are sacraments (see *Augusti*, Dogmengeschichte, l. c.).—*Göthe*, from the æsthetic point of view,

* On the Word of God, see above, § 291.

defended the Roman Catholic doctrine of seven sacraments (in his Aus mei nem Leben, ii., p. 117 ss., Stuttg., 1829).—The Moravian brethren have introduced among themselves the ecclesiastical usages of the washing of feet, the kiss of charity, and the casting of lots, without regarding them as sacraments; they attach, however, great importance to the first of these; see Idea Fidei Fratrum, p. 548 ss. In addition to the Lord's Supper, they also celebrate the love-feasts.—As regards the idea of sacrament, several theologians took the ground that the term *sacrament* is not very judiciously chosen. See *Storr*, Doctrina Christiana, § 108 ss. *Reinhard*, p. 556: "It would have been better, either not to introduce into systematic theology the term sacrament, which is used in so many senses, and does not once occur in Holy Writ, or to use it in the free and indefinite manner of the earlier church." Comp. *Schleiermacher*, Christliche Glaubenslehre, vol. ii., p. 415 ss. p. 416: "The common mode of commencing with this so called general idea, and explaining it, serves to confirm the erroneous opinion, that it is a proper doctrinal idea, involving something essential to Christianity, and that baptism and the Lord's Supper are of so much importance principally because this idea is therein realized."—The Idea Fidei Fratrum treats only of baptism and the Lord's Supper, without discussing the idea of sacrament, p. 275 ss. See on the other side, *Hase*, Dogmatik, p. 529, and *Schenkel* (Protestantismus, i. 393 sq.), who gives prominence in express terms to the objective idea of sacrament.—*Martensen* (Dogmatik, 470) says that "the sacred pledges of the new covenant contain an actual bestowal of the nature and life of the risen Christ, who does not merely give redemption and completion to the spiritual, but also to the corporeal." *Ebrard*, ii. 1, distinguishes the "Word of God," as a means of grace from the sacraments, in such a way as to make the former the instrumental cause of the converting (*metanoëtic*) agency of the Holy Ghost; and the sacraments, on the other hand, to be means of grace for the objective, regenerating (*ἀναγεννᾶν*) energy of the same spirit, considered as the Spirit of Christ.

[2] In the year 1714, *L. Ch. Sturm*, former professor of mathematics in the university of Frankfort, who had seceded from the Lutheran to the Reformed Church, published his Mathematische Beweis vom Abendmahle, in which he (like Schwenkfeld, § 259, note 15), confounded the subject and the predicate of the words used by our Lord, by explaining, τοῦτο as equivalent to τοιοῦτο. He was opposed by *J. A. Fabricius*, *J. G. Reinbeck*, *F. Buddeus*, and others. About the middle of the eighteenth century, *Ch. August Heumans*,* himself a Lutheran, dared to prove, "that the doctrine of the Reformed Church concerning the Lord's Supper is correct and true." His work did not so much lead Calvinists to engage in a controversy, as gave rise to dissensions among the Lutheran theologians themselves. See *Schlegel*, Kirchengeschichte des 18 Jahrhunderts, ii., p. 307 ss. *Von Einem*, p. 325 ss.

[3] The writings of rationalists abounded in trivial matters even on liturgical points. Thus *K. R. Lange* proposed (in Hufnagel's liturgische Blät-

* He held this view quietly as early as 1740, and avowed it, 1754, in his explanation of the New Testament (on 1 Cor., xi. 24); but it was even then suppressed before the publication of the work. He next wrote the above essay in 1762, which was not published, however, till after his death, 1764.

tern, vol. i.) the following formula for use at the administration of the Lord's Supper: "Partake of this bread! may the spirit of devotion bestow all his blessings upon you. Partake of a little wine! Virtuous power is not in this wine, it is in you, in the divine doctrine, and in God." See *Kapp*, Liturgische Grundsätze, Erl., 1831, p. 349.

[4] *Ernesti* defended the Lutheran interpretation of the words used by our Lord on exegetical grounds (Opuscula Theologica, p. 135 ss.), but expressed his sorrow that many were more inclined to adopt that view, quæ rationi humanæ expeditior est et mollior. The supernaturalists *Storr* and *Reinhard*, were satisfied with a more indefinite statement of the Lutheran doctrine (*Storr*, Doctrina Christiana, § 114; *Reinhard*, p. 588). *Knapp* went so far as to say (vol. ii., p. 482): "The doctrine of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper should never have been made an article of faith, but have been confined to the theological problems." Others, *e. g. Hahn*, *Lindner*, and *Schwarz*, endeavored to help the Lutheran doctrine, by introducing their own explanations. See *Hase*, Dogmatik, p. 583.

[5] The Pietists and Moravian Brethren, retained the most firmly the idea *of means of grace*. The mystics gave prominence to the specific dynamic efficacy of the sacraments, and hesitated, in respect to the Lord's Supper, to interpret the words of institution in a purely tropical sense. Thus *Oetinger* (Theologie, 345): "We must be very cautious about perverting any word of the Holy Ghost, so as to make of it a merely metaphorical figure of speech. The fulness of the spirit is attenuated by thin and lean interpretations. A man with a good, sound heart feels more than can be expressed in words; and so we must let the words stand in all their fulness." See also his Lehrtafel (in *Auberlen*, 408): "As the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ, bodily, it also imparts itself bodily to the water, blood and spirit, in baptism and the supper. For regeneration comes of spirit and water, both in creaturely wise; Spirit is the *causa materialis*, not *efficiens*,—despite the scandal of philosophers about materialism." Ibid., 373 (in *Auberlen*, 409): "Water and blood are penetrated with the fire of the Holy Ghost." Evangel. i. 286 sq. (in *Auberlen*, 436): "As it is by the invisible, everywhere diffused essence and substance of Christ, that the equally invisible power of the bread and the wine is made to nourish all men, although they be merely earthly men—so too must the new, unseen, inward man be nurtured and preserved by this self-same, everywhere present, substance and essence of Christ. We all have body and soul. The spirit from Christ's body offers himself daily to all, that they may receive him into the essence of their body and soul, and transform their mortal nature. The angels—they eat the bread of angels. The Israelites in the wilderness ate the manna ignorantly; but Christ gives clear and full understanding (John vi)." On Oetinger's positive relation to the Lutheran, and negative relation to the Reformed and Roman Catholic doctrine, see *Auberlen*, 325, 336, 413, 426–28. On his position as to the early church, see p. 442 sq.

[6] The rationalists differed among themselves. The strict Lutheran doctrine was, of course, excluded. Many adopted what we may call the intermediate view of Zwingle; others fell down into the Socinian theory and even lower, while some rose up as high as the Calvinistic scheme. *Benjamin*

Hoadly, of the Anglican Church, a friend of the Arian, Samuel Clarke, defended the Socinian theory in his treatise: Of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Lond., 1735. He was combated by *Whiston*, *Waterland* and *Mill*, defending the doctrine of the 39 Articles. See *Schlegel*, l. c. *Von Einem*, ii., p. 536, ii. 2, p. 751.—*Henke* followed Schwenkfeld in the interpretation of the words used by our Lord, Lineamenta, cxxxvii., p. 250.—*Tieftrunk* adopted the view of Kant, that the design of the Lord's Supper is to awaken and develope a spirit of cosmopolitan brotherhood; see his Censur, p. 296 ss. (comp. Kant, Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, p. 282). The better class of German rationalists explained the ordinance in its memorial and symbolical significance, in a becoming spirit, insisting on its profound moral import, and in accordance with the spirit of Zwingle. See especially *D. Schulz*, Die Lehre vom Abendmahl; and compare *Wegscheider*, § 180, *a*. He regards the elements used in the Lord's Supper not merely as signa significantia, but as signa exhibitiva; and thus approximates to the Calvinistic view.

[7] *Schleiermacher*, Christliche Glaubenslehre, ii., p. 139 ss., p. 388 ss. *De Wette*, Dogmatik, p. 93. *Nitzsch*, System der christlichen Lehre, p. 317. *Ebrard*, Das Dogma von heiligen Abendmahl, Bd. ii., 785 sq.; and his Dogmatik, 631 sq. Compare the article of *Julius Müller* in Herzog's Realencyclop. i. 21 sq. [See also the works referred to § 258, p. 308.]

[8] *Scheibel*, das Abendmahl des Herrn, Breslau, 1823. *Sartorius*, Vertheidigung der lutherischen Abendmahlslehre, in the Dorpat Beiträge, 1832, vol. i, p. 305 ss. *Th. Schwarz*, Ueber das Wesen des heiligen Abendmahls (in *Ebrard*, p. 874). The innumerable recent controversial writings (by *Kahnis*, *Rudelbach*, *Rodaz*, *Ströbel*), we cannot here individually cite. The Lutheran view is most comprehensively presented in *Kahnis*, Die Lehre vom Abendmahl, Leipz., 1851 (against *Ebrard*). See also *Rückert*, Das Abendmahl, 1856, and *Baur*, in Theol. Jahrb., 1857.

[9] *Hegel*, Philosophie der Religion, vol. ii., p. 274: "The idea involved in the Lutheran doctrine is this, that the motion begins with the external (element), which is a plain and common thing, but that the participation, the consciousness of the presence of God, is brought about so far forth as the external element is consumed not merely corporeally, but in spirit and in faith. God is present only in spirit and faith.... Here is no transubstantiation in the common sense of the word, but yet a transubstantiation, by which the external is abolished, and the presence of God is purely spiritual, so that the faith of the participant is essential." (The last idea is not in accordance with the Lutheran view; comp. § 259, note 10.)

[10] The Anabaptists in Switzerland.—Oncken in Hamburgh (from the year 1834).—The Anabaptists in Wirtemberg (from the year 1787): see *Grüneisen*, Abriss einer Geschichte der religiösen Gemeinschaften in Würtemburg, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die neuen Taufgesinnten, in Illgens Zeitschrift für historische Theologie, 1841, part. i., p. 64 ss. [See § 285, *b*, note 23; § 285, *e*, note 19.]

[11] *Schleiermacher*, Christliche Glaubenslehre, ii., § 138, p. 382 ss.

[12] *W. Hofmann*, Tauf und Wiedertaufe, Stuttg., 1843. *Martensen*, Die christliche Taufe und die baptistische Frage, Hamburg, 1843 [1859]; see

also his Dogmatik, p. 398. *Höfling*, Das Sacrament der Taufe, Erlangen, 1846. Bd. i. 28: "The chief point is, and remains, this—that we recognize the grace of God, the Spirit of God, God himself, as working with us *in*, *with* and *under* the water of the baptism, so that by means of this act, we receive regeneration, an actual reception and transition into the saving and life-giving fellowship with Christ, justification and the blessed life." Compare the acts of the Frankfort Church Diet, 1854.

[13] Pusey on Holy Baptism; in the work of *Weaver-Amthor*, p. 22 sq. [See also, above, p. 308, 426, 427.]

§ 304.

ESCHATOLOGY.

Flügge, Geschichte des Glaubens an Unsterblichkeit, Auferstehung, Gericht und Vergeltung, Leipz., 1794–1800. *Weisse* Die philos. Bedeutung der Lehre von den letzten Dingen (Studien u. Kritiken, 1836). *Kling*, on Eschatology in Herzog's Realencyclop. iv. 136 sq. [*I. H. Fichte*, Idee der Persönlichkeit und d. individuellen Fortdaner, 2te. Aufl, 1855. Abp. *Whately*, Revelations of a Future State, 1855. *Alger*, Belief in Immortality; see Christ. Examiner, 1861.]

The decline of church life during the period of rationalism appeared to the more religious to portend a defection from pure christianity; and in proportion to the clearness of such indications, the higher were their expectations as to the near approach of the end of all things. *Bengel*,[1] and *Jung Stilling*,[2] endeavored to ascertain the exact period when this event would take place. The former fixed upon the year 1836. In opposition to these positive expectations, the rationalists sought to explain away the Scriptural doctrine of the second advent of Christ,[3] and to limit the duration of the punishments of hell.[4] Earlier hypotheses, *e. g.* concerning the sleep of the soul, the migration of souls, Hades, etc., were also revived and their number increased by new ones.[5] Nevertheless both rationalists and supernaturalists retained the hope of man's personal existence after death; not only those who believed in a revelation, such as *Lavater*, but also the leaders of rationalism looked hopefully into the world to come.[6] *Kant* examined the arguments commonly advanced in support of the doctrine of immortality (as he had done in reference to the existence of God), and approved only of the *moral* argument (for the practical reason).[7] In opposition to that form of belief in immortality which had lost its Christian basis, and had its real origin in selfish motives, the modern philosophy and theology justly insisted upon that idea of *eternal life* which as Christ himself taught was to begin upon earth.[8] But this idea in connection with the free concession, that we could form no definite conception of the future,[9] led *some* of the disciples of modern

speculation to a total denial of the world to come, and a deification of the present life:[10] while *others* endeavored more fully to fortify the church doctrine about the last things by means of the same philosophy.[11] The prophetical parts of the Old and New Testament were also investigated anew in view of their didactic contents; what was veiled in vision and image was applied to the confirmation of a theosophic and apocalyptic eschatology.[12] That the kingdom of God, which has its commencement and completion in Jesus Christ, the only-begotten son of God, is ever approaching; that the idea of a glorified union of the human with the Divine, by means of a living faith in Christ, in relation to the whole as well as to individuals, will be more and more realised in the fulness of time; and that notwithstanding the manifold change of forms, the spirit of Christianity will always be the *incorruptible inheritance* of humanity—these are hopes reaching far beyond a sensuous millennarianism, and which we are justified in cherishing by the consideration of the course, which, amidst numerous conflicts and errors, the development of Christian theology has taken to the present hour.

[1] In his Erklärte Offenb. Joh. oder vielmehr Jesu Christi, aus dem Grundtext übersetzt, durch die prophetischen Zahlen aufgeschlossen, und Allen, die auf das Werk und Wort des Herrn achten, und dem, was vor der Thüre ist, würdiglich entgegen zu kommen begehren, vor Augen gelegt durch *Joh. Albr. Bengel*, Stuttg., 1740.—Sechzig erbauliche Reden über die Offenb. Joh., sammt einer Nachlese gleichen Inhalts, etc., 1747.—Cyclus, sive de anno magno solis, lunæ, stellarum consideratio ad incrementum doctrinæ propheticæ atque astronomicæ accomodata, Ulm., 1745. For the controversial writings to which his works gave rise, see *Burk's* Life of Bengel, p. 260, and the chronological table, p. 273. Comp. *Lücke*, Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis, p. 548 ss. [*Stuart*, Commentary on the Apocalypse, i., p. 469.] *Oetinger* looked into the future in the spirit of Bengel (see *Auberlen*, p. 516 sq.)*. *Magnus Freidrich Roos*, Auslegung der Weissagungen Daniels, 1771; see the Appendix to Auberlin's work on Daniel [transl. Edinb. 1859]. *John Michael Hahn* and others.

[2] In his Siegesgeschichte der christlichen Kirche, oder gemeinnützige Erklärung der Offenbarung Johannis, Nürnb., 1779. Appendix, 1805, 1822. *A. F. v. Meyer* on Sheol, etc., followed Stilling.

[3] *Henke*, Lineamenta, cxiv.: Atqui his in oraculis (Scripturæ S.) non omnia, ut sonant, verba capienda; multa ad similitudinem formæ judiciorum humanorum et pompæ regiæ expressa esse illi etiam fatentur, qui adspectabile aliquod judicium, a Christo ipso per sensibilem speciem præsenti in his terris agendum, præfiguratum esse atque præstituto tempore vere actum iri defendunt. Interim vel sic, districtis quasi exuviis orationis, remanent multa, quæ non modo obscuritatis, sed etiam offensionis plurimum habent, etc.... Insunt vero istis rerum, quas futuras esse prædixerunt, imaginibus hæ simul graves et piæ sententiæ: 1. vitam hominibus post fata instauratum iri, eosque etsi eosdem, non tamen eodem modo victuros esse; 2. sortem cujusque in hac

vita continuita talem futuram, qualem e sententia Christi, h. e. ad veritatis et justitiæ amussim, promeruerit; 3. plane novam fore rerum faciem in isthac altera vita, et longe alias novæ civitatis sedes; 4. animo semper bene composito et pervigilanti, magnam illam rerum nostrarum conversionem, ne inopinatos oprimat, expectandam esse. Comp. *Wegscheider*, Institutt., § 199, 200. *Herder* (Von der Auferstehung), and *De Wette* (Religion und Theologie, p. 259 ss.), and endeavored to make a distinction between the symbols and that which is signified by them. [Millennarian views have been revived in Germany by *Delitzsch*, *Hofmann*, *Auberlen*, and *Floerke*. See *W. Floerke*, Die Lehre vom tausendjährigen Reiche, Marburg, 1859: comp. Zeitschrift f. lutherische Theologie, 1861, p. 558 sq.; and *Köhler* in the same periodical on Schriftwidrigkeit des Chiliasmus, 1861, pp. 412–475. *J. N. Schneider*, Die Chiliastiche Doctrin, Schafhausen, 1859.—In England the Quarterly Journal of Prophecy, 1849 sq., and in the United States, Lord's Theol. and Lit. Review, advocate the millennarian expectations; compare Princeton Review on Modern Millennarianism, 1852, 1853. *Cumming*, *Elliott*, *Birks* and *Keith* in England, advocate, with more or less exactitude of dates, the Second Coming. See also *G. S. Faber*, Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, 3, 1828 sq.; Fullfilled Prophecies, etc., 5th ed., 3 vols., 1818. Prof. *S. Lee*, Study of Holy Script. (in part millennial), 1830. *D. Brown*, Christ's Second Coming, 1851; *W. Wood* and *H. Bonar* (in reply), Coming and Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. *Alpheus Crosby*, The Second Advent, Bost., 1850. *J. F. Berg*, the Second Advent not premillennial, Phil., 1859. *Geo. Duffield*, Dissertation on the Prophecies of the Second Coming, New York, 1842. *Nathan Lord*, on the Millennium, Hanover, 1854. *S. Waldegrave*, New Test. Millennarianism (Bampton Lectures), Lond., 1854.—On the *Adventists*, *Millerites*, in the United States (end of world in 1843), see above, p. 451.]

[4] Some supernaturalists also propounded milder views. On the contrary, others defended the eternity of punishment.—*Kant* numbered such queries among those *childish questions* from which the inquirer could learn nothing, even were they answered (Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, p. 83, note). The literature is given by *Bretschneider*, Entwurf, comp. p. 886 ss. [For the English literature, including universalists, restorationists, annihilationists, see above, p. 451.]

[5] The Psychopannychy (sleep of souls) was advanced by *John Heyn*, in a letter addressed to Baumgarten; see his Theologische Streitigkeiten, iii., p. 454, and probably also by *J. J. Wettstein* (see *Hagenbach*, in Illgens Zeitschrift für historische Theologie, 1839, i., pp. 118, 119); by *J. G. Sulzer* (Vermischte Schriften, 1781, ii.), and to some extent by *Reinhard*, Dogmatik, p. 656 ss. The latter rejects indeed the true doctrine of a sleep of the soul, but admits that the soul immediately after its separation from the body falls into an unconscious state, because the change made by death is so powerful, that the activity of the soul might for a time be interrupted by it. Comp. also *Simonetti*, Gedanken über die Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit und dem Schlaf der Seelen, Berl. 1747.—[*Isaac Taylor*, Physical Theory of another Life, and Abp. *Whately* on the Future State, 1855, advocate a condition of partial consciousness between death and resurrection.] Concerning the *migration of souls* (μετεμψύχωσις) in an ascending order, see *Schlosser*,

zwei Gespräche, Basel, 1781. *Herder*, Zerstreute Blätter, vol. i., p. 215. *F. Ehrenberg*, Wahrheit und Dichtung über unsere Fortdauer, Leip., 1803. *Conz*, Schicksale der Seelenwanderungshypothese, Konigsb., 1791. (*Bretschneider*, Entwurf, p. 846 ss.). [North American Review, Jan., 1855, on Transmigration.]—The doctrine of an *intermediate state* (Hades) was especially advocated by *Jung Stilling*, Geisterkunde, § 211, 212: "If the departed spirit who has left this world in a state of imperfect holiness, carries along some elements which cannot be introduced into the heavenly regions, he must remain in hades until he has put away all that is impure: but he does not suffer pain, excepting that of which he himself is the cause. The true sufferings in hades are a kind of home-sick longing for the pleasures of this world forever lost." Comp. his Apologie der Geisterkunde, p. 42–45.—Among modern theologians, *Hahn* has adopted these views (christliche Glaubenslehre, § 142; *Bretschneider*, Entwurf, p. 886). Passing by the theory of the intermediate state, *Priestley* endeavored to reconcile the scriptural doctrine of resurrection with the philosophical idea of immortality, by supposing that there is a particular organ of the soul which developes itself in the hour of death; see British Magazine, 1773, vol iv., part 2; *Bretschneider*, Entwurf, p. 861.—*Swedenborg*, with peculiar hypotheses, developed his Eschatology: vol. 2, p. 284. He rejected the church doctrine of the resurrection, as founded upon a too literal interpretation of Scripture. (Resurrection and the general judgment have already taken place.) Men continue to live as men (the righteous as angels) after their departure from this world, and are greatly surprised to find themselves in such a state. Immediately after death they again have a body, clothes, houses, etc., and are ashamed of the erroneous opinions they had formed concerning the future life (comp. § 297). Those who were inclined towards the good and true dwell in magnificent palaces, surrounded by a paradise filled with trees.... The opposite takes place in the case of those who have indulged in sin. They are either in hell shut up in prisons without windows, in which there is light coming, as it were, from an ignis fatuus; or they live in deserts, and reside in huts, surrounded by sterile wastes, and haunted by serpents, dragons, owls, and other such objects corresponding to their evil inclinations. Between heaven and hell there is an *intermediate place*, called the world of spirits. Every man goes thither immediately after death; the intercourse which there takes place between the departed spirits is similiar to that which men carry on upon earth, etc. Divine Revelation, pp. 250, 251. By the new heaven and the new earth Swedenborg understood the new church; see what he says on the Last Judgment, in his Divine Revelation.—*Oetinger's* original views on "The World of the Invisible," are found in his Theologie, p. 354 sq.; see *Auberlen*, pp. 325 sq., 400 sq. The Oxford Tractarians adopted, with some modifications, the doctrine of purgatory; see the work of *Weaver-Amthor*, p. 33; and Tract 90, p. 25 sq.

[e] *J. C. Lavater*, Aussichten in die Ewigkeit, in Letters to Zimmermann, Zürich, 1768 ss.—*Ch. F. Sintenis*, Elpizon, oder über meine Fortdauer im Tode, Danz., 1795 ss.—By the same; Oswald der Greis; mein letzter Glaube, Leipz., 1813.—*Engel*, Wir werden uns wiedersehen, Gött., 1787, 88. The literature is more fully given by *Bretschneider*, Entwurf, p. 827, 879 ss.

[7] The arguments commonly advanced, especially in modern times, are the following: 1. The *metaphysical*, *i. e.* that which is derived from the nature of the soul; 2. The *teleological*, *i. e.* that which is derived from the capacities of man as not fully developed upon earth; 3. The *analogical*, *i. e.* that which is derived from nature—spring, the caterpillar, etc.; 4. The *cosmical*, *i. e.* the argument derived from the starry world; 5. the *theological*, *i. e.* the argument founded on the various attributes of God; 6. The *moral* (practical), *i. e.* the argument founded on the disparity in the struggle for happiness and that for moral perfection. See *Kant*, Kritik der Praktischen Vernunft, p. 219 ss. For the literature, see *Bretschneider*, l. c., and *Hase*, Dogmatik, pp. 111, 112. *Strauss*, Dogmatik, ii., p. 697 ss. [Comp. *Bushnell*, Nature and the Supernatural, 3d ed., New York, 1858. *R. W. Landis*, The Immortality of the Soul, etc., New York, 1859. Is the Soul Immortal? New Englander, Aug., 1853. *T. M. Post*, in Bibl. Repos., 1843; New Englander, Feb. and May, 1856. *W. R. Alger*, in Christ. Examiner, Jan., 1856, Jan., 1857; Journal of Am. Unit. Assoc., 1858. Christian Review, April, 1861.]

[8] *Fichte*, Anweizung zum seligen Leben, p. 17: "*Most certainly* there is perfect happiness *also beyond* the grave for *those who have in this world begun to enjoy it*, and this is by no means different from that which we may here at any time begin to possess. We do not enter into this state of happiness merely by being buried. Many will seek happiness in the future life, and in the infinite series of future worlds, as much in vain, as in the present life, if they think it can be found in anything but that which is now so near to them that it can never be brought nearer—viz. the eternal." Concerning the resurrection of the dead, comp. ibid., p. 178. *Schleiermacher*, Reden über die Religion, p. 172 (3d edit.) says that most men form their idea of immortality from irreligious motives, inasmuch as their wish to be immortal has its origin in their aversion to that which is the very end and aim of religion. [*E. White*, Life in Christ: Immortality as the Privilege of the Regenerate. Lond., 1846.]

[9] *Schleiermacher*, Christliche Glaubenslehre, ii. § 157 ss. *De Wette*, Dogmatik, § 107, 108.

[10] *F. Richter*, Die Lehre von den letzten Dingen, Bresl. 1833. By the same: Die Geheimlehren der neueren Philosophie, nebst Erklärung an Herrn Prof. Weisse in Leipzig., Ibid., 1833.—By the same: Die neue Unsterblichkeitslehre, ibid., 1833. *Strauss*, Glaubenslehre, ii. p. 793: "*The idea of a future world....is the last enemy which speculative criticism has to oppose, and if possible (!) to overcome*"!! The natural practical consequences of this doctrine are seen in epicurianism, Communism, etc., though the speculative philosophy seeks to gaurd against these results.

[11] *Ch. Weisse*, Die philosophische Geheimlehre von der Unsterblichkeit des menschlichen Individuums, Dresd., 1834: and also, Ueber die philosophische Bedeutung der Lehre von den letzten Dingen, in the Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1836, p. 271 ss. *J. H. Fichte*, die Idee der Persönlichkeit und der individuellen Fortdauer, Elberf., 1834, 1855. *C. F. Göschel*, Von den Beweisen für die Unsterblichkeit der menschlichen Seele, im Lichte der speculativen Philosophie; eine Ostergabe, Berlin, 1835. Comp. *Bretschneider*, p. 831. *Franz Bauder* and others in the same controversy.—

Theologically, the way has been prepared for an entire revision of the domain of eschatology, from the cosmological and anthropological, as well as from the christological and soteriological points of view, in the doctrinal systems of *J. P. Lange*, ii. 1227 sq.; *Rothe*, Theol. Ethik, ii. 156 sq.; *Liebner*, Christologie, i. 1; *Martensen*, 424 sq. (the completion of the church); *Ebrard*, Dogmatik, ii. 710 sq. (the macrocosmic completion of all things).

[12] *Auberlen*, Der Prophet Daniel, und die Offenbarung Johannes, Basel, 1854 [translated, Edinb., 1859]; against Hengstenberg's transposition of the millennium into the middle ages—the so-called "church period." *M. Baumgarten*, Die Nachtgesichte Sacharia's, Braunschweig, 1855.

INDEX.

Abbadie, ii. 222.
Abbot, Bishop, ii. 187.
Abelard, i. 384, 391; works, 393; on reason and revelation, 416, 417,; tradition, 422; being of God, 436; attributes, 446; unity, 448; omnipotence, 449, 452; optimism, 452; Trinity, 457, 459; theodicy, 473; on sin, ii. 24; hereditary sin, 26; freedom, 28; christology, 38; the right of the devil, 43; redemption, 46, 47; matrimony, 115.
Abraham's bosom, ii. 130.
Absolute, philosophy of, ii. 399.
Absolution, as sacrament, ii. 303, 325, 513.
Abulfaradsh (Barhebraeus), i. 385.
Abuses of Roman Catholic Church, ii. 289.
Acacius of Cæsarea, i. 255.
Acceptilatio, ii. 356, 360.
Accidentia sine subjecto, ii. 95.
Accommodation, ii. 467.
Acindynus, i. 475.
Acoluthi, ii. 115.
Acominatus, i. 385.
Act and testimony, ii. 444.
Active obedience, ii. 354, 357–8, 362, 497–8.
Acts of councils, i. 31.
Actus personales (Trinity), ii. 335.
Adam's first estate, ii. 251 sq., see *Original Righteousness, Innocence.*
Adam's sin, i. 292, 297, 299; ii. 22. See *Original Sin*, the *Fall.*
Adam, Jean, ii. 246.
Adam Kadmon, i. 116.
Adams, Neh., ii. 440.
Adams, Thos. ii. 191.
Addison, ii. 383.
Adelmann, Epistle, ii. 92.
Adiaphoristic controversy, ii. 148.
Adminicula gratiæ, ii. 303.
Adopting act, ii. 169.
Adoptionism, i. 383; ii. 35.
Adorantes (Unitarians), ii. 212.
Adoratio, ii. 302.
Adoration of angels, i. 141; of saints, ii. 301; see *Images, Mary, Saints.*
Adso, ii. 120.
Advent, second, ii. 124, 370; see *Eschatology.*
Adventists, ii. 451.
Æneas of Paris, i. 454.
Æneas Silvius, i. 383, 454.
Æons, i. 118, 338.
Æpinus, (Hock), ii. 351, 353.
Ærius, of Sebaste, i. 375.
Ætius, i. 255, 256.
Affectiones Scripturæ, ii. 245
African School, i. 386.
Agatho of Rome, i. 283.
Ἀγεννησία, i. 264.
Agnoetæ, i. 281.
Agobard, of Lyons, on Jews, i. 382, 415; works, 387; on Inspiration, 425.
Agricola, John, ii., 148, 248.
Agrippa of Nettersheim, ii. 22, 23.
Aichard, see *Eckart.*
Αἰώνιος, i. 379.
Αἱρεσις, i. 52.
Aix-la-Chapelle, Council, i. 454.
Aktistetæ, i. 281.
Alanus of Ryssel (ab Insulis), i. 395, 396; on faith, 417; attributes of God, 446; on the Trinity, 463; on atonement, ii. 49; on works, 69; on sacraments, 78; on orders, 116.
Albertus Magnus, i. 396, 397; on knowing God, 439; on Erigena, 442; on immaculate conception, ii. 30, 32; christology, 35, 38; on indulgences, 70; concomitance, 102, 103.
Albigenses, i. 384.
Albrecht, ii. 52.
Alcherus, ii. 15.
Alciat, ii. 211.
Alcuin, i. 387; on revelation, 422; on procession of Holy Ghost, 454; adoptionism, ii. 35, 37.
Alexander, see *Natalis* (Noel) ii. 206.
Alexander III., ii. 38.
Alexander of Alexandria, i. 249, 250.
Alexander of Constantinople, i. 250.
Alexander Hales, i. 396, 397; knowing God, 439; on omnipresence, 446; love of God, 453; creation, 470; theodicy, 473; devil, 478; sinlessness of Mary, ii. 31; on assurance, ii. 65; on thesaurus meritorum, 69; seven sacraments, 78; confirmation, 87; Lord's Supper, 98; the cup, 102; on concomitance, 103; penance, 111.
Alexander, Archibald, J. A., J. W., ii. 445; W. L., ii. 435.
Alexander of Stourdza, ii. 459.
Alexandria, School of, i. 95, 239, 275; ii. 375.
Alexandrian culture, i. 50.
Alford, ii. 423.
Alicubi, i. 445.
Aliquando, i. 445.
Allatius: see *Leo.*
Allegorical Interpretation, i. 93, 199, 428 ii. 247.
Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek, ii. 381.
Allies, ii. 427.

Allihn, ii. 409.
Allœosis, ii. 346.
Alogi, i. 60, 61, 117, 170; ii. 328.
Ἄλογος, i. 458.
Alombrados, ii. 205.
Alschwinus: see *Alcuin*.
Alsted, ii. 300; on creation, 338–9.
Alting, H., ii. 170, 172.
Alvarius Pelagius, ii. 32.
Amalarius, ii. 90, 91.
Amalrich of Bena, i. 403, 442, 469; on redemption, ii. 53; on Paradise, 133.
Ambrose, i. 230, 235; on Trinity, 264; sin, 295; on invocation of angels, 338; on baptism and forgiveness, 360; on eucharist, 362, 364; first used *missa*; on future state, 377; ii. 96, on change in elements (spurious?)
America, Discovery of, i. 411.
Ames, William, ii. 174.
Ammon, ii. 396, 405, 499, 513; religion, 461.
אמון, i. 115.
Amphilochius on transubstantiation, i. 361.
Amsdorf, Nicolas, ii. 148; on justification, 286.
Amularius, i. 383.
Amulo on Jews, i. 383.
Amyraldus (Amyraut), ii. 179, 180, 181, 187; on predestination, 277, 278.
Anabaptists, ii. 154, 155, 208, 211, 364, 513, 516; on clergy, 291.
Analogia Fidei, ii. 230, 231, 235.
Analytic Method, ii. 150, 152.
Ἀναμαρτησία, i. 178.
Anastasius of Alexandria, i. 276.
Anastasius Sinaita, i. 288.
Ancient Church History, works on, i. 40.
Andreæ, Jacob, ii. 149, 157, 207.
Andreæ, Valentin, ii. 157.
Andrews, Lancelot, ii. 182, 187.
Andrews, W. W., ii. 414.
Angels, i. 138, 139, 338, 475; ii. 341, 482.
Angelites, i. 268.
Angelolatry forbidden, i. 338.
Angelom, i. 429.
Angelus Silesius, ii. 204, 340.
Anglican Divines, ii. 182, 416; on the church, ii. 296; on baptism, ii. 364, 369.
Anhalt, ii. 149.
Anna, Empress, i. 475.
Annihilation, i. 226.
Annihilationists, ii. 451.
Anointing, extreme unction, ii. 112.
Anselm, i. 391; works, 392, 412; on evidences, 415; on faith, 416, 418; on Bible reading, 431; ontological argument, 433; on knowing God, 439; on attributes of God, 445, 446; on eternity and omnipresence, 445, 446; omnipotence, 449; on procession of Holy Ghost, 454, 455; on Trinity, 457, 459, 460, 463; on the best world, 473; angelology, 476; on fall of devil, 477, 478; creationism, ii. 14, 17; image of God, 19, 20, 21; on sin, 23, 24; on imputation, 26–7; on freedom, 28; on sinlessness of Mary, 31; christology, 36, 38; on birth of Virgin, 40; redemption, 41; Cur Deus Homo, 43, 44; soteriology, 53, on election, 60, 61; transubstantiation, 96, 99, 100, 101; on atonement, 355, 363, 497.
Anslem of Havelberg, i. 454.
Ancyra, Council, i. 255.
Antagonism, Age of, ii. 373 sq.
Antecedent will, i. 332, 474.
Anthropology, i. 148, 229, 286; of scholastics, ii. 13; modern, 251, 485.
Anthropomorphism, i. 106, 109, 328.
Anti-Burghers, ii. 431.
Antichrist, ii. 119. 216.
Antideistica, ii. 382.
Ἀντιδόσεως τρόπος, ii. 35, 352.
Antilegomena, i. 317.
Antinomians, ii. 183, 192.
Antinomian Controversy, ii. 148, 248.
Antioch, School, i. 239, 275, 320.
Antioch, Synod, i. 248, 253.
Antipodes, i. 473.
Antitrinitarians, i. 131; ii. 210, 328. See *Unitarians*.
Ἀντίτυπα in Eucharist, ii. 108.
Apelles, Gnostic, i. 221.
Appleton, Jesse, ii. 440.
Aphthartodocetæ, i. 281.
Apocalypse, i. 213, 214, 319.
Apocrypha, i. 84, 318; ii. 230, 233, 472.
Apocryphal Gospels, i. 85.
Apollinaris, i. 229, 271, 351; millennarian, 368.
Apologetics, i. 19, 20; ancient, 77, 313, 382; mediæval, 414; modern, ii. 220.
Apology of Augsburg Confession, ii. 146, 148: see *Augsburg*.
Apostles' Creed, i. 51, 173, 354; ii. 157, 249, 329, 354.
Ἀπομνημονεύματα, i. 85.
Apostles, i. 44–6.
Apostolate, new, ii. 510.
Apostolical Fathers, i. 63.
Apostolical Succession, ii. 291. See *Episcopacy*.
Apotheosis, ii. 354.
Apthorp, ii. 448.
Aquarii, i. 205.
Aquinas, Thomas, i. 396; works, 397; on Scotus, 398; contra Gentiles, 415; on miracles, 415; reason and revelation, 416, 419; tradition, 422; inspiration, 426; interpretation, 430; ontological argument, 432, 436; on knowing God, 439; on Erigena, 442; attributes of God, 447; omnipotence, 451; will of God, 453; procession of Holy Ghost, 456; creation, 470, 472; theodicy, 474; angelology, 476; devil, 478; psychology, ii. 14; on immortality, 16; on state of innocence, 18, 19; on pura naturalia, 19; the fall, 23; hereditary sin, 26; on original justice, 28; on immaculate conception, 30; sanctification of Mary, 32; christolology, 35, 38; atonement, 47, 50; on three offices of Christ, 50; incarnation, 54, 55; on election, 60, 62; on justification, 63, 64; on grace, 64, 65; on indulgences, 70; the Hyperdulia, 76; number of sacraments, 77, 79; idea of sacraments, 80, 82; indelible

character, 82; on baptismal grace, 84, 85, 86; confirmation, 87; transubstantiation, 98, 99; on sacrifice in eucharist, 100; the cup, 102; concomitantia, first used, 103; on penance, 109, 110, 111; extreme unction, 113; orders, 114, 115; on matrimony, 116, 117; resurrection, 123; on the judgment, 125, 126; purgatory, 127; on limbus infantum, 131; beatitude and dos, 134; hell, 136, 137, 354.
Arabici, i. 159.
Archaeology, works on, i. 22.
Arch-heretic, i. 54.
Aretius, ii. 170, 171.
Arguments for Being of God, i. 325, 432: see *God*.
Arianism, i. 229, 241, 249, 252–4, 256, 259, 271, 328; in England, ii. 184, 328, 332, 478.
Aristeas, i. 88.
Aristotelianism, i. 390, 395, 397, 408, 423; ii. 16.
Arles, Synod, i. 306.
Arminians, ii. 208, 214, 218, 277; in England, 182, 187; learning of, 214, 216; on Scripture, 241; on interpretation, 243; on state of innocence, 254; on original sin, 260; on freedom, 270; on justification, 281, sq.; on the church, 292; on sacraments, 303; on Lord's Supper, ii. 309; Trinity, 328, 332; baptism, 367; infant baptism, 369.
Arminius, ii. 214. 215.
Arnauld, ii. 201, 202, 277; on eucharist, 321.
Arnd, John, ii. 154, 156; on justification, 287.
Arnobius, i. 171, 230, 234; on sin, 295; miracles, 314; inspiration, 321; on being of God, 325; on eternity of God, 332; on providence, 336; annihilation, 226, 376, 379.
Arnold of Brenia, i. 412.
Arnold, J. G., ii. 154, 156.
Arnold, Thos., ii. 428.
Art, mediæval, ii. 121.
Artemon, i. 60, 61, 117, 118, 170.
Articles XLII, XXXIX, Church of England, ii. 164, 166–7; of Lambeth, 182, 185; of Dort, 164; of Remonstrants, 214, 215; of Smalcald, 146; of Torgau, 147.
Ἄρτος, ii. 108.
Artotyrites, i. 205.
Asbury, ii. 450.
Ascension-body, i. 177: see *Resurrection*.
Asceticism, i. 291; ii. 154.
Ascusnages, i. 268.
Assembly, Westminster, ii. 169, 182.
Asterius, i. 257.
Associate Presbyterians, ii. 431.
Assurance, ii. 65, 277.
Athanasian Creed, i. 269; ii. 249, 329.
Athanasius, i. 230, 231, 245, 247, 249, 251; on the Arian, 256; on Holy Spirit, 257–9; procession of Holy Spirit, 263; on Trinity, 265; on Christ's humanity, 271; on Apollinaris, 273; on sin, 291, 293; defense of Christ., 313; Bible, 316; canon, 319; on being of God, 325; nature of God, 328; on dualism, 330; creation, 333; on redemption, 346; on Lord's Supper, 365; ii. 29.
Atheism, ii. 475
Athenagoras, i. 63, 68, 87; on unity of God, 103, 110; on Logos, 120; on angels, 139, 142; on freedom, 155; on resurrection, 218, 219.
Attalus, i. 104.
Atonement, i. 179, 345; ii. 41, 46, 354, 496; extent of, 275, 351; recent German controversy, 502–3: see *Death of Christ*, *Redemption*.
Attributes of God, i. 109, 331, 445; ii. 385, 476: see *God*.
Attritio, i. 188; ii. 109, 111, 136, 325.
Auberlen, ii. 473.
Ἀνχημα, ii. 352.
Auchterarder Creed, ii. 431; Case, 434.
Audæus, i. 290.
Audians, i. 328.
Auditio, ii. 288.
Auditores, i. 352.
Augsburg Apology on original righteousness, ii. 253; on sacraments, 304; mass, 311; penance, 325; incarnation, 345; atonement, 355–6; baptism, 365; on Anabaptists, 368.
Augsburg Confession, ii. 146, 147; variata, 147; on original sin, 258; on freedom, 272; on justification, ii. 282; faith, 283; on the order of redemption, 288; on the church, 292; on the mass, 293, 310; on saints, 301; on word and sacraments, 305; Lord's Supper, 316; the cup, 312; penance, 325; Trinity, 329; incarnation, 345; on eschatology, 370; on restitution of all things, 371.
Augusti, ii. 453, 513; on the doctrine of the devil, i. 477; on spiritual knights, ii. 88.
Augustine, i. 230, 236–7, 240; procession of Holy Spirit, 263; Trinity, 265; Christ's body, 282; traducianism, 288; soul and body, 289, 290; freedom, 291; the fall, 292; sin, 295, 300; freedom, 302; predestination, 303; on religion, 312; revelation, 312; De Civitate Dei, 313; miracles, 314; on tradition, 316; the Bible, 317; inspiration, 321; interpretation, 323; councils, 324; ontological argument, 325; nature of God, 328; attributes of God, 331; creation, 333; the six days, 333; the Trinity in creation, 334; preservation, 335; evil, 337; worship of angels, 338; fall of angels, 341; conversion of devil, 342; redemption, 348, extent of, 351; the church, 352–3; visible and invisible church, 354; sacraments, 355–6; baptism, 357–8–9; children not baptized, 360, 366; chiliasm, 369; resurrection, 370–1; purgatory, 373–4; heaven, 376; future punishment, 376; degrees of happiness and suffering, 379; freedom, ii. 18, 25.
Augustinianism, i. 239, 265, 296–305, 381; ii. 25, 60, 261, 265, 485.
Augustus, Elector, ii. 149.
Aureola, ii. 132.

Auricular Confession, ii. 111, 325.
Αὐτεξούσιον, i. 155.
Autonomy of will, i. 155.
Αὐτόθεος, i. 268.
Auxilius on ordination, ii. 114.
Averrhoes, i. 397.
Avicebron, i. 397, 443.
Avicenna, i. 397.
Avitus of Vienne, i. 306.
Ayton, ii. 298.
Azymites, ii. 108.

Baader, ii. 457, 521.
Backus, Charles, ii. 435, 437.
Backus, Isaac, ii. 449.
Bacon, Francis, ii. 221, 223, 224.
Bacon, L., ii. 441.
Bacon, Roger, ii. 121, 406–7, 421.
Baden disputation, ii. 160.
Bagot, ii. 384.
Bahrdt, C. F., ii. 382, 498.
Baier, J. W., ii. 151, 153; on proofs of Being of God, 335.
Baillie, ii. 185.
Bain, A. ii. 425.
Baird, S. J., ii. 445.
Bajus, ii. 202, 280.
Balaamites, i. 54.
Balfour, ii. 451.
Balverius, ii. 689.
Ballou, ii. 441, 451.
Bancroft, Abp., ii. 186.
Bangor Controversy, ii. 416, 417.
Bangs, ii. 450.
Bannéz, ii. 280.
Baptism, i. 197, 356; ii. 84, 363, 513; delay of, i. 358; of blood, 203, ii. 84; of heretics, i. 202, ii. 86; of martyrdom, i. 358; of tears, 358, ii. 100; and faith, ii. 365; and original sin, i. 359, 364–5; repetition of, ii. 86; sins before and after, ii. 110; Romish, ii. 364; its nature and necessity (Protestant view), ii. 364.
Βάπτισμα, i. 198.
Baptismal regeneration, ii. 366, 368.
Baptismus Clinicorum, i. 198.
Baptists in America, ii. 443, 449; in England, ii. 423.
Baptists, Confessions of, ii. 169.
Bar Sudaili, i. 368.
Barclay, ii. 217; on Scripture, 238; on the church, 295.
Bardesanes, i. 59, 137.
Barhebræus, i. 386.
Bari, council, i. 454.
Barlaam, i. 474.
Barlow, Thos. ii. 182, 183, 190, 297.
Barnabas, i. 64, 78; epistle, 318; on redemption, 182.
Barnes, Albert, ii. 433, 442, 448, 503, 505.
Baroe, ii. 185.
Barret, ii. 185.
Barrow, ii. 183, 188, 297.
Barthels, ii. 385.
Baruch, i. 318.
Basedow, ii. 381.
Basil of Ancyra, i. 255.
Basil the Great, i. 230, 231; on Holy Spirit, 260; procession of Holy Spirit, 263–4; on Trinity, 265; on sin, 291; inspiration, 321; angels, 338; on baptism, 357; baptism of heretics, 360; end of world, 373; heaven, 377
Basilides, i. 118, 170.
Basle, ii. 413.
Basle Confessions, ii. 163; on authority of creeds, 250; on Scripture, 232; on original righteousness, 253; on original sin, 258; on immaculate conception, 262; on decrees, 273; on election, 274; on faith, 284; on church, 292; on discipline, 299; on number of sacraments, 304; on Lord's Supper, 317; Trinity, 330.
Basle, councils, ii. 32, 72.
Basnage, ii. 200.
Bates, Wm., ii. 183, 190.
Bauer, Bruno, ii. 409.
Baumgarten Crusius on Reformation, ii. 140; Roman Catholic Church, 206; Socinus, 212; sentimental religion, 381.
Baumgarten, M., ii. 522.
Baumgarten, S. J., i. 37; ii. 378, 392.
Baur, F. C., i. 48, 58, 105; his works, ii. 409, 498; christology, 495; on Beryl, i. 132; angelology, 139; Gnostic fate, 157; Gnostics, 173; redemption, 180; Arius, 250; on Nicene creed, 252: Marcellus, 258; Philoponus, 268; Eunomius, 272; Monotholites, 284; Pelagius, 303; on the Predestinatus, 306; on apologetics, 314; tradition, 324; on ontological argument, 327; Manichees, 334, 353; Gregory of Nyssa, 347; theory of atonement, 350; theories of the eucharist, 363; scholasticism, 390; Abelard, 393; the Lombard, 395; Aquinas and Scotus, 398; scholasticism, 401; mysticism, 402; Anselm, 418; Aquinas, 419; Abelard and Aquinas on tradition, 422; Anselm's argument for Being of God, 434; David of Dinanto, 443; the scholastic Trinity, 469; on Aquinas on creation, 470; on Erigena, ii. 24, 40; on the Damascene, 36; on adoptionism, 36; on Aquinas' christology, 38; Anselm, 43, 46, 47; Aquinas on sacraments, 97; on John of Damascus on the eucharist, 108; Catholicism and Protestantism, 141; Lutheranism and Calvinism, 142; Sebastian Frank, 155; Schwenckfeld, 155; Calvinism, 160, 274; justification, 284; faith, 284, note; Osiander, 286, 287; on communicatio idiomatum, 347–8; on Schwenckfeld, 348–9; on Protestant atonement, 355–6; active and passive obedience, 358; Grotius, 361; Osiander, 363; the issue of the Reformation, 375; on English deism, 379; pietism, 388; Schleiermacher, 404; Hegel, 501; on faith, 514.
Bautain, ii., 454, 457, 458.
Bay, de; see *Bajus*.
Bayle on Keckermann, ii. 172, 222.
Baxter, ii. 183, 191, 222, 224, 227, 371
Beach, J. ii. 448.
Beard, J. R., ii. 422.
Beasley, ii. 446.
Beatitudo, ii. 134.

Beatitudo and dos, in Aquinas, ii. 134.
Beattie, ii. 432.
Beatus, ii. 37.
Becanus, ii. 197, 200.
Beck, J. C., ii. 378.
Beck, J. T., ii. 406, 410.
Bede, i. 387; on predestination, ii. 57; Lord's Supper, 89, 90; extreme unction, 112.
Beecher, Edward, ii. 441.
Beecher, Lyman, ii., 443.
Βεελζεβούλ, i. 142.
Beets, ii., 413.
Beghards, i. 384; christology, ii. 40; on redemption, 53; on hell, 132, 137.
Beguines, i. 384, 423; on resurrection, ii. 123.
Behmen, see *Böhme*.
Bekker, ii. 41; on reason, 248.
Being of God, i. 325, 432; ii. 333, 476.
Belgic Confession, on original sin, ii. 259; on church, 292.
Belief in Christ, in God, ii. 68.
Bellamy, ii. 435, 437.
Bellarmine, ii. 197, 199; on interpretation, 234; on inspiration, 247; on original righteousness, 252; on creatianism, 264; freedom and grace, 269; justification, 283; the church, 291; notes of the church, 297; church a state, 299; sacrifice, 311; satisfaction, 357–8.
Bellows, ii. 442.
Belsham, ii/ 421.
Beman, ii. 445.
Benedict, D., ii. 449.
Benedict XII., on sleep of soul, ii. 129.
Benezet, ii. 451.
Benoit, ii. 225.
Bengel, J. A., ii. 383, 388, 389, 471, 517, 518; on Pelagianism, 505; on Zinzendorf, 479, 497.
Bentham, ii. 423, 424.
Bentley, Rd., ii. 226.
Berg, J. F., ii. 451.
Bergen Book, ii. 149.
Berengar, i. 384; on sacraments, ii. 77; Lord's Supper, 89, 92, 93, 94.
Berkeley, ii., 226, 383–4, 422.
Berington, ii., 422, 458.
Bernard of Clairvaux, i. 402, 412; on faith, 417, 419; Scripture, 423; interpretation, 429; omnipresence, etc., 447; freedom, ii. 28; on immaculate conception, 30, 31; atonement, 46, 48; on the two swords, 72; on worship of Mary, 75; on feet washing, 78; baptism, 86.
Berne, ii. 160, 413.
Berne Disputation, ii. 160.
Beron, i. 132.
Berriman, ii. 333.
Berthold, i. 421; on creation, 471; on angels, 476; creatianism, ii. 15; on image of God, 20; on preachers, 70; papacy, 72; on sacraments, 79; baptism, 85; purgatory, 128; limbus infantum, 131.
Berti, ii. 199.
Bertramn, see *Ratramn*.
Beryllus, i. 60, 117, 131–2.
Beveridge, ii. 183, 189
Beza, ii. 166, 170–71; supralapsarian, 274.
Bible, i. 315–19, 421 465; in general use, 92; reading of, 428; Cranmer's, ii. 183; Luther's, 145; see *Inspiration, Interpretation, Scripture*.
Bible Societies, ii. 406.
Bible and Tradition, ii. 30; see *Tradition*.
Biblical Criticism, i. 424; ii. 416; see *Criticism*.
Biblical Learning in England, ii. 416, 423; in America, 442; Roman Catholic, 206; see *Bible*.
Biblical Theology, i. 16.
Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum, ii. 212; on Trinity, 331.
Bickersteth, ii. 425.
Biddle, ii. 213.
Biel, Gabriel, i. 399, 400; on opus operatum, ii. 82, 83.
Billroth, ii. 409, 469.
Billuart, ii. 199.
Bilson, ii. 186.
Bingham, ii. 186, 296.
Biran, Maine de, ii. 415.
Bircherod, ii. 152.
Birks, ii. 429.
Blackburne, Archd., ii. 327, 422.
Black Death, i. 412.
Blair, Hugh, ii. 430, 432.
Blanc, Louis le, ii. 277.
Blandrata, ii. 211.
Blasche, ii. 400, 482; on sin, ii. 487; Christology, 492; atonement, 501.
Blau, ii. 455.
Blessig, ii. 414.
Blondel, ii. 180, 181, 279.
Bloomfield, S. T., ii. 423, 429.
Blount, ii. 222, 225.
Blunt, J. J., ii. 428.
Bluttheologie, ii. 392.
Bochold, ii. 209.
Bockshammer, ii. 470.
Bodin, Jean, ii. 222.
Body and Soul, ii. 13, 151–3; see *Anthropology*.
Boëthius, i. 230, 238; on Trinity, 267; ontological argument, 325, 390.
Bogomiles, ii. 122, 384.
Bohemian Brethren, ii. 71; confession of, 169.
Bogardus, ii. 450.
Böhme, ii. 154, 156, 301, 371, 390; on inspiration, 245; justification, 287; Trinity, 336; creation, 339; christology, 350.
Böhmer, J. H., ii. 510; on pantheism, 474–5.
Bolingbroke, ii. 379.
Bolsec, ii. 277–8.
Bona, ii. 204.
Bonald, de, ii. 458.
Bonaventura, John of Fidanza, i. 396; works, 399; on reading the Bible, 431; omnipresence of God, 447; eternity, 448; creation, 472; angelology, 476; psychology, ii. 15; immortality, 17; sin of Adam, 23; immaculate conception, 32; atonement, 51; election, 60–2; grace, 65; worship of Mary, 75; sacraments, 77, 79; confirmation, 87; Lord's Supper, 93; the cup, 102; penance, 111; marriage, 117; purgatory, 127.

Boniface, ii. 127, 306.
Boniface VIII., ii. 72, 88.
Bonnet, ii. 470.
Book of Bergen, ii. 149.
Book of Common Prayer, ii. 166, 167, 182; on baptism, 368.
Book of Discipline, Scotch, ii. 185.
Book of Homilies on Justification, ii. 285.
Boos, ii. 456.
Booth, ii. 417, 429, 507.
Boothroyd, ii. 419.
Boquin, ii. 172, 175, 176.
Borhaus, (Cellarius,) ii. 209.
Borromeo, ii. 204.
Bose, de, ii. 279.
Bost, ii. 415.
Boston Synod, ii. 169.
Boston, Thos., ii. 192, 431.
Bossuet, ii. 197, 199, 204; on Bp. Bull, 188; on union, 219; on worship of saints, 302; on transubstantiation, 323–4; purgatory, 326.
Boucat, ii. 199.
Bourignon, Antoinette, ii. 177.
Bouterwek, ii. 409.
Bowden, ii. 449.
Bowen, ii. 446.
Boyle, ii. 222, 226.
Brachmand, ii. 152.
Bradshaw, Wm., ii. 186.
Bradwardine, Thos., ii. 62.
Brahminism, i. 114.
Bramhall, ii. 183, 188, 224.
Brandt, ii. 215.
Braun, ii. 174.
Bread, see *Lord's Supper*.
Breaking of Bread, ii. 323; see *Lord's Supper*.
Breckling, ii. 156.
Bremen Gymnasium, ii. 175–6.
Brenz on the canon, ii. 242; on Œcolampadius, 314.
Bres, Guido de, ii. 167.
B esten, in Zwingle, ii. 257.
Brett, ii. 183, 189, 296.
Bretland, ii. 421.
Bretschneider, ii. 398, 507.
Breviarium Rom., ii. 197.
Brevint, ii. 297.
Bridges, John, ii. 186.
Bridget, St., i. 427; ii. 32.
Bridgewater Treatises, ii. 429
Broad Church, ii. 423, 428.
Brogden, ii. 297.
Brokesby, ii. 298.
Bromley, ii. 177–8, 205.
Brooks, ii. 191.
Broughton, John, ii. 371.
Brown, Thos., ii. 433–4.
Browne, Bp. Peter, ii. 225, 227.
Browne, Simon, ii. 227.
Browning, ii. 185.
Brownson, ii. 459.
Broughton, ii. 227.
Bruce, W., ii. 435.
Bruch, ii. 414, 477.
Bruno, Eusebius, ii. 96.
Bruno, ii. 221
Bucanus, ii. 170, 171; on Adam's innocence, 254; creationism, 264.
Bucer, ii. 163, 170, 218; in England, 185; on Lord's Supper, 317–18.
Buchanan, ii. 434.
Büchlein von der deutschen Theologie, ii. 65.
Büchner, ii. 475.
Buckeridge, ii. 297.
Buckminster, ii. 441.
Buddeus, J. F., ii. 376; on König, 153.
Bugenhagen, ii. 147.
Bugri, i. 384.
Bull, Bp. Geo., ii. 183, 188, 210, 213, 285; on Trinity, 328, 332.
Bullarium, i. 32.
Bullinger, H., ii. 160, 164, 166; confession of, 163.
Bunsen, ii. 411, 428.
Bunyan, ii. 183, 190.
Burdigal, ii. 199.
Burgess, ii. 190, 418, 421.
Burghers, ii. 431.
Burmann, ii. 170, 174, 199; on Christ's obedience, 359.
Burmap, ii. 441.
Burnet, Thos., ii. 183, 189, 416, 417, 418; on Sarpi, 195; on foreign orders, 297.
Burning of World, i. 221; see *Eschatology*.
Burr, ii. 438.
Burroughes, ii. 190.
Burton, Asa, ii. 439.
Burton, Ed., ii. 422, 423, 428; on Gnostics, i. 223.
Bury, Arthur, ii. 213.
Bush, George, ii. 448.
Bushnell, ii. 436, 442, 503.
Butler, Alban, ii. 454.
Butler, Charles, ii. 458.
Butler, Bp. Joseph, ii. 227, 422.
Butler, W. A., ii., 425.

Cabasilas: see *Nicolas*.
Cæcilian, i. 353.
Cæsar of Heisterbach, i. 443; ii. 100.
Caius, i. 213.
Cainians, i. 202.
Cajetan, i. 439; ii. 197.
Calamy, ii. 183, 191, 213, 298, 333.
Calderwood, ii. 192.
Calixt, George, ii. 150, 152, 157, 158, 219, on inspiration, 244; tradition, 249; justitia originalis, 255; sin, 263, 266; creationism, 266; justification, 286; ubiquity, 316; Trinity, 337.
Calixtines, i. 410.
Calov, ii. 151, 153; against Calixt, 250; on original rectitude, 253; on sin, 263, 266.
Calvin, ii. 159; works, 161; Institutes, 161; influence, 162; Consensus Genevensis, 164; Catechism of Geneva, 168, 182; on Scripture, 231, 236; inspiration, 242; original righteousness. 253; original sin, 257; creationism, 264; predestination, 273–4; on Castellio and Bolsec. 277–8; justification, 282; on Osiander, 287; order of salvation, 288; the church, 292, 293; on excommunication, 299; sacraments, 307–8; Lord's Supper, 309, 317, 318; the

mass, 311; on Westphal, 318; on Zwingle, 318; charged with Arianism, 329; on Trinity, 329; on nature of creation, 338; Satan, 342; angels, 342; person of Christ, 345; three offices, 353; atonement, 356; obedience of Christ, 358; on Osiander, 363; baptism and original sin, 365; on psychopannychy, 370, 371.
Calvinism, ii. 141, 142; its peculiarity, 160; symbolical books, 162; theology, 170 sq.; on decrees, 268 sq.; on the church, 293–4.
Calvinism and Lutheranism, ii. 141, 142, 149, 159, 160, 162; attempts at union, 218, 228, 229; decrees, 268; faith, 284; economy of redemption, 288; worship, 290; ordination, 295; the Lord's Supper, 314 sq.; the host, 323; christology, 345; on Christ's humiliation, etc., 351; baptism, 364 sq.
Calvinism in England, ii. 182, 185, 417; in America, 435; in Greek Church, 295.
Calvinists, ii. 452, 513.
Cambridge, Synod, ii. 169.
Cameron, John, ii. 180; on obedience of Christ, 362, 363.
Cameronians, ii. 431.
Campanella, ii. 221.
Campanus, John, ii. 211.
Campanus, Wm., ii. 331.
Campbell, Alex., ii. 449.
Campbell, Geo., ii. 379, 432.
Campbell, McLeod, ii. 428.
Campbellites in America, ii. 443.
Campe, ii. 381.
Candlish, ii. 434.
Canisius, Catechism, ii. 197, 200.
Cannæ Eucharisticæ, ii. 103.
Canon, i. 83, 230, 317, 383, 424.
Canon Law, ii. 71.
Canons of Trent, ii. 196.
Canus, ii. 197, 200.
Canz, ii. 377.
Capadose, ii. 413.
Capernaitic Interpretation, i. 366; ii. 89, 94.
Capito, ii. 170; on Lord's Supper, 318.
Capnio: see *Renchlin*.
Cappel, ii. 179, 278.
Carleton, Bp. George, ii. 182, 188, 466.
Carlovingian Age, i. 386.
Carlstadt, ii. 154; on Lord's Supper, 309, 310; Scripture, 236; on criticism, 241.
Caroli, ii. 329.
Carpenter, Lant, ii. 421.
Carpocrates, i. 59.
Carpov, ii. 377.
Carpzov of Dresden, ii. 392.
Carson, ii. 429.
Cartesian Philosophy, ii. 178, 221.
Carthage, i. 239.
Carthage Synods, i. 298, 317.
Cartwright, ii. 182, 184, 186, 298.
Cassander, ii. 218.
Cassian, John, i. 230, 237, 287, 306, 343.
Cassiodorus, i. 390.
Castellio, ii. 277, 278.
Cataphrygians, i. 60.
Catechism of Calvin, ii. 182; Canisius, 197; Cranmer's, 183; Geneva, 164; Heidelberg, 164, 165; of Leo Judæ, 307; of Luther, 146, 148; of Moscorovius, 212; Poinet's 166; Roman, 196; Racovian, 210, 212; of Socinus, 212; of Schmelz (Socinian), 212; of Schomann (Socinian), 212; Westminster, 169.
Catechisms, i. 32.
Cathari, ii. 122, 384; on purgatory, 127.
Catharinus, ii. 198.
Catholic (*ancient*) *Doctrine*, i. 62.
Catholicism: see *Romanism*.
Catholics, union with Protestants, ii. 218.
Catlin, ii. 440.
Cattenburg, Andr. A., ii. 216.
Cave, ii. 298.
Cecil, Richard, ii. 425.
Celestine of Rome, i. 277, 296, 309.
Celibacy, i. 411; ii. 116.
Cellarius, ii. 209.
Celsus, i. 137.
Cerdano, ii. 220.
Cerdo, i. 59.
Ceremonies, ii. 301.
Cerinthus, i. 55, 57, 170, 213, 215.
Certitudo salutis, ii. 277.
Cerularius, Michael, ii. 108.
Cesar of Arles, i. 306, 373: see *Cæsar*.
Cesaro-papism, ii. 299.
Chalcedon, Council, i. 282.
Chaldee Christians, i. 385.
Challoner, ii. 459.
Chalmers, ii. 431, 434.
Chamier, ii. 170, 171.
Champlin, ii. 446.
Chandler, Bp. ii. 225.
Chandler, T. B., ii. 449.
Channing, ii. 436, 441.
Chantepie, ii. 413.
Character indelibilis, ii. 80, 294.
Charenton Synod, ii. 181.
Chardieu (Sardel), ii. 172.
Charlemagne, i. 453; on image worship, ii. 76.
Charles the Bald, ii. 58.
Charles II. (England), ii. 182.
Charnock, ii. 183, 190.
Charron, ii. 222.
Chatel, ii. 457.
Chateaubriand, ii. 457.
Chandieu, ii. 166.
Chauncy, ii. 438, 449, 451.
Checkley, ii. 448.
Cheese in the Lord's Supper: see *Artotyrites*.
Χειροτονία, ii. 114.
Chemnitz, ii. 149, 150, 151.
Chénevière, ii. 415.
Children, Communion of, ii. 109: see *Communion*.
Chillingworth, ii. 180, 183, 194.
Chiliasm, i. 119, 213, 360: see *Millennarianism*.
חכמה, i. 115.
Choniates: see *Nicetas*.
Chrism, ii. 364.
Χοῖσμα, ii. 87, 112, 118.
Christ, Life of, works on, i. 43; human nature, 271, ii. 175; redemption by, i.

345; two wills, 282; glorified body, 282, ii. 177; God-Man, 171; union of soul and body in death, 41; second advent, 124; sinlessness, 178, 490, 494; ideal and historical, 489. See *Christology, Natures, Will, God-man, Hypostasis, Atonement, Redemption, Advent, Monothelite, Trinity*, etc.
Christian II., Elector, ii. 151.
Christianity, i. 44, 60, 313, 414; ii. 461, 463.
Christology, i. 169, 229, 243, 277; ii. 35–56, 344, 485, 489.
Chrysostom, i. 230, 232, 255; on Christ's body, 282; on sin, 293; the Scripture, 317; inspiration, 320; providence, 335; Lord's Supper, 362, 364; resurrection, 370, 377; on future punishment, 376, 380.
Chubb, ii. 222, 226.
Church, i. 193, 352, ii. 71, 289, 519; organization, 299; representation, 300; visible and invisible, i. 354: see *Bishop, Priests, Pope, Presbyterian, Clergy*, etc.
Church of England on the Episcopate, ii. 291; in America, 448: see *England*.
Church History, works on, i. 39; Tables of, 40.
Church and State, ii. 71, 299, 509, 511.
Churches dedicated to angels, i. 338.
Churchill, Edmund, ii. 371.
Chytræus, ii. 149.
Clairvoyance, ii. 482.
Clanburg, ii. 179.
Clap, Thomas, ii., 437.
Clarendon, Lord, ii. 224.
Clarke, Samuel, ii. 183, 194, 210, 213, 225, 226, 329, 332, 414, 478; on Dodwell, 371.
Clarisse, ii. 413.
Clarkson, D., ii. 191.
Classical studies, i. 406, ii. 383.
Claude, ii. 279; on eucharist, 324.
Claudius of Savoy, ii. 211.
Claudius of Turin, i. 387.
Clausen, ii. 412.
Clemens, ii. 457.
Clement of Alexandria, i. 63; works, 72, 76, 79, 110, 111; on inspiration, 89; tradition, 96, 97; on being of God, 102; on unity of God, 103; names of God, 105; on anthropomorphism, 107; on Logos, 120–1; creation, i. 133, 135; providence, 136, 137; on Christ, 175; sinlessness of Christ, 178; redemption, 181, 189; belief, 190; the church, 193; baptism, 199, 202; Lord's Supper, 204; resurrection, 220; intermediate state, 223, 281.
Clement of Rome, i. 65, 78; on redemption, 182; eschatology, 226; on resurrection, 217, 218.
Clement IV., ii. 105.
Clement V., ii. 84, 95.
Clement VI., ii. 69.
Clement VIII., ii. 280.
Clementine Homilies, i. 55, 57, 77, 85, 143, 154, 163, 197, 199.
Clergy, ii. 114, 290.
Clericus (Le Clerc), ii. 199, 216.
Clerke, Gilbert, ii. 213.
Clemangis, i. 423, ii. 73.
Cobham, Lewis, ii. 121.
Cocceius, ii. 170, 173, 175; on Interpretation, 241, 247; on atonement, 356.
Cochlæus, ii. 197, 198.
Cœtus Party, ii. 451.
Colani, ii. 415.
Coleridge, ii. 423, 424, 442, 446.
Collections of works of Fathers, etc. i. 34.
Collegial system, ii. 509.
Collegium Trinitatis, ii. 351.
Collenbusch, ii. 502.
Collier, Arthur, ii. 333.
Collins, ii. 222, 223, 228.
Colloquium Charitativum, ii. 219.
Colloquium Lipsiacum, ii. 169.
Colloquy of Marburg, ii. 309, 316.
Cologne, i. 412.
Combe, François de, ii. 205.
Commenius, ii. 178.
Common-sense Philosophy, ii. 220.
Communio, ii. 208, 323.
Communion of Children, i. 205, 367, ii. 109.
Communion of Sick, ii. 323.
Communicatio idiomatum, ii. 344, 351.
Comprehensibility of God, i. 327, 438.
Comte, ii. 415, 424.
Concomitance, ii. 95, 102, 103.
Concordia, ii. 146, 150: see *Formula*.
Concursus Dei, i. 137, ii. 341.
Condillac, ii. 379.
Conferentie Party, ii. 451.
Confessio oris, ii. 109.
Confession, ii. 325; to laymen, 111; auricular, 111.
Confessions, conflicts of, ii. 452.
Confessions of Faith (see *Symbolism*), Anglican (XXXIX Articles), ii. 164, 166–67; Augsburg, 146, 147, Apology of, 147; Baptist, 169; Basle, 162; Second of Basle (First Helvetic), 163; Brandenburg, 164, 168; of Cyril Lucar, 207; of Damascus, 249; Dort, 164, 168; of Episcopius, 214; Gallic, 164, 166; Geneva, 164; of Greek Church (1642), 207; Hungarian, 164, 167; Marchica, 275; of Mennonites, 209; Polish, 169; of Reformed Churches, 162 sq.; Remonstrants, 214; Savoy, 169; Scotch, 164, 167; Tetrapolitana (Argentinensis, Suevica), 162; of Thorn, 164, 168; Westminster, 169.
Confirmation, ii. 87, 325, 513.
Confutation of Augsburg Confession, ii. 146, 147.
Confutatio of 1550, ii. 272.
Congregationalism, works on, ii. 298.
Congregationes de Auxiliis, ii. 278.
Cononites, i. 372.
Conrad, ii. 211.
Conradi, ii. 493.
Consecration, formulas of, i. 363; ii. 114.
Consensus of Church, ii. 249.
Consensus Dresdensis, ii. 149; Genevensis, ii. 164, in England, ii. 185; Sendomirensis, 169, 219; Tigurinus, 164–5.
Consensus Repetitus, on inspiration, ii. 244 on traducianism, 264; on church, 294

on breaking the bread, 323; on Trinity, 335; Trinity in Old Test., 337.
Consequent Will, i. 474.
Conservatives, ii. 374.
Constance, Council, ii. 33, 103.
Constant, ii. 414.
Constantine, i. 251, 253; on councils, 324.
Constantine Monomachus, ii. 108.
Constantinus Pogonatus, i. 283.
Constantinople Council, (2d General,) i. 252; synod of, 754, ii. 108.
Constantinople, conquest of, i. 411.
Constantius, i. 253.
Constitutio Unigenitus, ii. 70.
Constitutions, Apostolical, i. 143, 318.
Consubstantiality of Sin, i. 246, 251.
Consubstantiation, ii. 107, 309, 320.
Contingence of Sin, ii. 266.
Contingency, argument from, i. 432.
Contritio Cordis, ii. 109, 111.
Conversio, i. 188; ii. 109, 288, 325.
Convocation, in England, ii. 417.
Conybeare, Bp., ii. 226.
Conybeare, ii. 429.
Co-operation, ii. 64, 269.
Cook, Geo., ii. 431.
Cooper, A. A., 222.
Coornpert, ii. 259.
Copleston, ii. 281, 423, 427.
Copts, i. 241.
Coracion, i. 368.
Corinth, church of, i. 53.
Corlobasus-Gnosis, i. 119.
Corona Aurea, ii. 132.
Corporeity of God, i. 107.
Corpus Christi Day, ii. 95.
Correspondences, ii. 472.
Cosin, ii. 183, 188, 296.
Cosmology, i. 432.
Cosmological Argument, i. 325, 432.
Coster, ii. 197, 200.
Cotton, John, 192, 298.
Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, i. 454; of Ancyra, 255; of Antioch, 253; of Arles, 306; Bari, 454; Basle, ii. 32, 72; Béziers, i. 430; Carthage, 298, 317; Constance, ii. 103, 104; of Constantinople (2d General), i. 252, 258; Constantinople, 754; ii. 108; Cressy, 56, 60; Diospolis, i. 298, 352; of Ephesus, i. 275; Florence, i. 454, 456; ii. 88, 108, 110, 113, 114, 128; Frankfort, ii. 37, 76; Hippo, i. 317; Jerusalem, 253; Langres, ii. 57; Laodicea, i. 317; Lateran, 283; ii. 16; Fourth Lateran, i. 442; ii. 97, 100; London, 166; Lyons, i. 454–6; Meaux, ii. 87; Nice, i. 251; second of Nice, ii. 108; Orange, i. 306; Oxford, i. 430; Paris, 442; ii. 32, 99, 166; Philippopolis, i. 253; Quiercy, ii. 56, 60; Rome, 89, 92–4; Sardinia, i. 253; Sens, 459; Soissons, 459; Tarragona, 430; Toledo, 263; Toulouse, 430; Tyre, 253; Trent, ii. 195, sq; Valence, i. 306; ii. 57, 60; Vercelli, 89, 92, 94; Vienne, 84, 95; Wesel, 165; Worcester, 113.
Council, see *Synod*.
Councils, acts of, i. 31; inspired by Holy Ghost, 324.
Courayer, ii. 298.
Cousin, ii. 415, 442, 446; on Abelard, i. 393.
Covenants, theology of, ii. 173.
Covenanters, ii. 431.
Couard, Wm., materialist, ii. 371.
Cowper, Wm., ii 425.
Cox, ii. 445.
Crakanthorp, ii. 186, 297.
Cramer, on scholastic questions, ii. 19.
Cranmer, ii. 182, 183, 185, 285; Catechism, 183; Bible, 183.
Cranz, ii. 391.
Created Light, i. 474.
Creation, i. 133, 332, 337, 469; ii. 481, prima (immediata), secunda (mediata), 339; of man, 263; and Trinity, i. 334.
Creatianism, i. 151, 286; ii. 13, 263.
Creeds, Athanasian, i. 269; Eusebian (four), 253; Sirmian, 253; Nicene, 251; Protestant view of, ii. 249: see *Apostles*, etc.
Credere Christo, Deum, Deo, in Deum, ii. 68.
Crell, J., ii. 210, 271.
Crell, N. ii. 149.
Crell, S., ii. 210, 361.
Cressy, council, ii. 56, 60.
Crisp, ii. 183, 191.
Criticism, age of, ii. 373, sq.; biblical, i. 424; ii. 383.
Crocius, ii. 175–6.
Crombie, ii. 434.
Crosby, A., ii. 519.
Cross, sign of, i. 180, 342; as a symbol, 182.
Crusader, ii. 120.
Crusius, ii. 388, 390, 471.
Crypto-Calvinists, ii. 149, 323.
Crypto-Lutherans, ii. 323.
Cudworth, ii. 180, 183, 193; ii. 333.
Culture, ancient, i. 50.
Cultus, see *Worship*.
Culverwel, ii. 183, 193.
Cumberland, Bp., ii. 193, 224.
Cumming, John, ii. 425.
Cunningham, ii. 434.
Cup withheld, ii. 102, 308.
Curcellæus, ii. 213, 216; on atonement, ii. 355, 361.
Curialists, ii. 512.
Curio, ii. 212.
Cusa, i. 423.
Cutter, Tim., ii. 448.
Cyprian, i. 63; works, 71, 104; ii. 84; on tradition, i. 97; on attributes of God, i. 110; on evil, 138; on the fall, 165; on redemption, 189; grace, 191; on the church, 193, 195; on baptism, 197, 201; on Lord's Supper, 205; on sacraments, 212; on millennium, 216; on heaven and hell, 226.
Cyran, St., abbot of, ii. 202.
Cyril, of Alexandria, i. 230, 234; on Holy Spirit, 263; on Nestorius, 275; Julian, 313; miracles, 314; Lord's Supper, 362.
Cyril, of Jerusalem, i. 14, 230, 233, 254–5; on Holy Spirit, 260, 282; sin, 293; attributes of God, 331; on angels, 341; on devil's conversion, 342; redemption, 349;

baptism, 358; Lord's Suppor, 362, 364; chiliasm, 369.
Cyril Lucar, ii. 206–7.
Cyrus, of Alexandria, i. 282.
Czerski, ii. 458.
Czengerina Confessio, see *Hungarica*.
Czolbe, ii. 475.

Dagg, ii. 446.
Daillé: see *Dallæus*.
D'Ailly, ii. 33.
D'Alembert, ii. 379.
Dalgairus, ii. 426.
Dallæus, ii. 180, 181, 279.
Damascene: see *John of Damascus*.
Damascus, Confession of, ii. 249.
Damiani, Peter, ii. 75.
Damianites, i. 268.
Damianus, i. 268.
Damm, ii. 380.
Dances of Death, ii. 121.
Daniel on Tatian, i. 157; on tradition, ii. 466.
Dannhauer, ii. 151, 153.
Danov, ii. 383, 387.
Dante, ii. 121, 122; on hell, 136, 138.
Darbyites, ii. 415.
Daub, ii. 407, 408; on the Trinity, 480; the devil, 482; the atonement, 501.
Daubeney, ii. 184.
D'Aubigné, ii. 415.
Davenant, John, ii. 182, 187, 219, 285.
Davenport, John, ii. 192.
David of Dinanto, i. 403, 442, 443; on revelation, 423.
Davidis, ii. 212.
Davidson, S., ii. 423, 428.
Davies, Samuel, ii. 438.
Davison, John, ii. 384.
Death, ii. 29, 164.
Death of Christ, i. 179, 345; and the devil, 183; necessary, 351: see *Atonement*.
דבר יהוה, i. 115.
Declaratio Thorunensis, ii. 164, 168.
Decrees, ii. 268 sq.: see *Predestination*.
Decrees of Dort, ii. 164, 168; of Trent, 196.
Decretals, works on, i. 32.
Decretum Gratiani, ii. 97.
De Dominis, ii. 218.
Defense of Christianity: see *Apologetics, Evidences*.
De Gasparin, ii. 416.
Degrees of happiness, i. 224.
Deified flesh of Christ, ii. 344, 348.
Deism, ii. 220 sq., 378; English, 223 sq., 383 sq., 474, 481; French, 380.
Delaney, ii. 384.
Delbrück, ii. 466.
Delft, Synod, ii. 179.
Delictum, i. 293.
Delitzsch, ii. 473, 502.
Demiurge, i. 77, 102, 110, 137, 160.
Demon of Socrates, i. 144.
Demonology, i. 138, 142, 342, ii. 43, 341, 482: see *Devil*.
Denck, ii. 211.
Denison Case, ii. 423, 427.
Denmark, ii. 412.
Denzinger, ii. 457.
Dereser, ii. 455
Derham, ii. 473
Descartes, ii. 178, 179, 221 on being of God, 333–34.
Descensus ad Inferos, i. 35, 187; ii. 130, 351, 354, 503.
Design of Creation, i. 334: see *End*.
Deus ex Machina, i. 171.
Deutsche Christenthumsgesellschaft, ii. 390.
"*Deutsche Theologie*," i. 402, 405; on the fall, ii. 25; on atonement, 52; christology of, 40, 350; on creation, 472; on love of God, 453.
Devil, i. 138, 142, 145, 475, ii. 341; and atonement, i, 183, 342, 345, ii. 41; personal, ii. 482: see *Demonology, Satan*.
Dewar, ii. 434.
De Wette, i. 47, 49, ii. 401, 406, 413, 465; on revelation, ii. 240; on Tauler and Ruysbrock, i. 404–5; on Deutsche Theologia, 405; à Kempis, 405; christology, ii. 493; on atonement, 497, 500; on freedom, 507.
Dewey, ii. 441.
De Witt, ii. 451.
Διάβολος, i. 142: see *Devil*.
Diaconi, ii. 115.
Dialectic Scholasticism, i. 395, ii. 35: see *Scholasticism*.
Διαθηκη, i. 84.
Dick, John, ii. 432.
Dick, Thos., ii. 434.
Dickinson, Jonathan, ii. 438.
Diderot, ii. 379.
Didymus, i. 379; on conversion of the devil, 342; on atonement, 351.
Dies Iræ, ii. 121.
Dietrich, ii. 382.
Διμοιρῖται, i. 275.
Dinter, ii. 398.
Diodorus of Tarsus, i. 275, 380, 432; on being of God, i. 325.
Diognetus, Epistle to, i. 67, 182.
Dionysius the Areopagite, i. 67, 329, 439: see *Pseudo-Dionysius*.
Dionysius of Alexandria, i. 230, 243, 245.
Dionysius of Rome, i. 243, 245.
Dioscurus, i. 277.
Diospolis, synod, i. 298, 352.
Dippel, ii. 222, 380, 496, 497.
Dipping of Bread, ii. 103.
Disciplina Arcani, i. 63.
Discipline, Protestant, ii. 299.
Disney, ii. 421.
Disputations, Zurich, ii. 160; Baden, 160 Berne, 160.
Divina Commedia, ii. 121.
Divorce, ii. 325.
Docetism, i. 55, 57, 173, 270, 281; ii. 31, 344, 348.
Doctrinal Theology, works on, and history of, i. 41.
Doctrines, History of, defined, i. 13; relation to other branches of theology, etc., 15–22; importance of, 23; mode of treatment, 23; division into periods, 26–30; sources, 30–36; works upon, 36–44.
Doddridge, ii. 420.

Döderlein, ii. 383, 386.
Dodsworth, ii. 427.
Dodwell, ii. 227, 298; on immortality, 371.
Dominicans, ii. 30, 279.
Dædes, ii. 413.
Dogma, meaning of, i. 13.
Donatists, i. 229, 240, 352, 357; ii. 291.
Donne, ii. 182, 186.
Doolittel, ii. 190.
Donum superadditum, i. 290; ii. 19. 251.
Dorner, cited, i. 47, 57, 58, 182, 213; on Philo, 115, 117; Tertullian, 122; Origen, 124; Nicene creed, 252; Nestorius, 277; Monothelites, 284; John of Damascus, 382; Nihilianism, ii. 38; Soteriology, ii. 53; Schwenkfeld, 348; Servetus, 349; works, 410.
Dort, Synod, ii. 164, 168; on authority of Scripture, 250; on original righteousness, 253; original sin, 259; supralapsarianism, 274–5.
Dos, ii. 134.
Dos and beatitudo, in Aquinas, ii. 134.
Dotes of blessedness, ii. 132.
Dositheus, i. 54.
Dove, E., ii. 429, 434.
Dove of Noah, i. 199.
Doxologies, i. 171.
D'Oyly, ii. 419.
Drélincourt, ii. 181.
Dresden Consensus, ii. 149.
Drobicius, ii. 371.
Drobisch, ii. 409.
Dualism, i. 142, 330, 333.
Du Bose, ii. 279.
Duchoborzi, ii. 460.
Duffield, ii. 444–5.
Du Hamel, ii. 199.
Dulia, ii. 74.
Dulon, ii. 411.
Δύναμις ὑψίστου, i. 125.
Duncker, i. 133.
Duns, see *Scotus*.
Duothelites, i. 284.
Durandus, abbot, ii. 96.
Durandus, of St. Pourçain, i. 399, 401; on knowing God, 439; adoptionism, ii. 37; festival of conception, 32; transubstantiation, 104 106.
Dury (Duræus), ii. 219.
Dusanus, see *Musculus*, ii. 170.
Dutch Reformed, in U. S., ii. 450.
Dwight, Timothy, ii. 440.

Eadie, ii. 434.
Eadmer, i. 455.
Eastern Church, i. 453. See *Greek*.
Ebed Jesu, i. 385.
Eberhard, J. A., ii. 382.
Ebionitism, i. 20, 55–6, 75, 117, 143, 170, 173, 178, 213–14; ii. 344, 489.
Ebrard, ii. 502; on Lutheranism and Calvinism. ii. 141; Zwingle, 312–13; Œcolampadius, 314; Schweizer, 508; the church, 511; sacraments, 514–16.
Ecclesia. See *Church*.
Ecclesia militans, triumphans, ii. 291; visibilis, invisibilis, 299.
Ecclesiastical Power, ii. 291; see *Church*, etc.
Ecclesiola in ecclesia, ii. 510.
Eck, ii. 144, 147, 197–8.
Eckart, Master, i. 402; pantheistic, 443; on the Trinity, 465; grace, ii. 67; hell, 132, 137.
Eckermann, ii. 383, 387.
Eclecticism, French, ii. 415.
Economy, the, i. 131.
Economy of Redemption, i. 188, 229; ii. 251, 288, 503.
Edelmann, ii. 380.
Edict of Religion, ii. 388–9.
Edmunds, J. W., ii. 452.
Education, theories of, ii. 486.
Edward VI., ii. 166.
Edwards, John, ii. 190.
Edwards, Jonathan, ii. 414, 435–6.
Edwards, Jonathan, jr., ii. 435, 439.
Edwards, Justin, ii. 448.
Edwards, Thos., ii. 420.
Egilo, abbot, ii. 91.
Eglin, ii. 175, 176.
Ehrenfeuchter, ii. 410.
Eichhorn, ii. 385.
Εἶδος, i. 268.
Εἱμαρμένη, i. 155.
Einsiedeln, reform in, ii. 159.
Ἔκδεσις, i. 283.
Ἐκκλησια, ἐκκλ. καδολική, i. 194.
Ἔκπεμψις, i. 265.
Ἔκπόρευσις, i. 265.
Elcesaites, i. 57.
Electi (Manichees), i. 352.
Election, ii. 60, 201, 275, 307.
Elements, visible in the sacraments, ii. 116.
Eleonora von Merlau, ii. 372.
Elevation of host, ii. 100, 323.
Eliot, John, ii. 193.
Elipandus, of Toledo, ii. 35, 37.
Elizabeth, St. i. 427.
Elizabeth, of England, ii. 166, 182
Ellicott, ii. 423, 429.
Elliott, ii. 450, 519.
Ellis, ii. 384.
Elster, ii. 380.
Elucidarium, ii. 126–7, 130, 131, 134, 136, 137.
Ely, E. S., ii. 443.
Emanation, i. 117.
Emerson, R. W. ii. 447.
Emlyn, ii. 213, 441.
Emmerich, ii. 414.
Emmons, ii. 436, 439.
Emory, ii. 450.
Enchanted World (Bekker's), ii. 178, 341.
Encyclopedia, Theological, ii. 406.
End of Creation, i. 334. See *Providence*.
End of World, i. 224, 373; ii. 119.
Endemann, ii. 378.
Energies in Christ, i. 283. See *Will*.
Engel, ii. 520.
Engelhardt, on mysticism, i. 403; on Ruysbrœk, 404.
England, Bp., ii. 459.
England, church of, ii. 412; on the church 296; against Rome, 297; foreign orders 297; baptism, 366, 368.

England, theology in, ii. 182, 416, 423; philosophy, 423.
English Deism, ii. 222–23, 380.
Enlightenment, period of, ii. 374; see *Rationalism.*
Enoch, Book of, i. 216.
Enthusiasts, ii. 156, 161, 305.
Ephesus, councils, i. 275, 298; Robber's Synod, 278.
Ephraem the Syrian, i. 230, 233, 282; on sin, 293.
Epicureans, i. 107.
Epiphanes, i. 59.
Epiphanius, i. 132, 230, 233, 246; procession of the Spirit, 263; inspiration, 322; resurrection, 370.
Episcopalians, ii. 512; in America, 443.
Episcopacy in England, ii. 291. See *England.*
Episcopius, ii. 213, 214, 215; on supralapsarians, 274.
Epistola Episc. Hispan. ad Episc. Galliæ, ii. 37.
Erasmus, i. 407; ii. 197, 198.
Erastianism, ii. 299.
Erdmann, ii. 409.
Erigena, i. 387, 389, 390, 403; his rationalism, 416; on tradition, 421; Scripture, 422, 423; interpretation, 428; on knowing God, 438; pantheism, 441, 442; on Trinity, 457, 458; on creation, 469; anthropology, ii. 13, 14; on the Mosaic narrative, 19; on sin, 24; sin caused the difference of sex, 29; on ideal Christ, 39; on predestination, 56, 58; Lord's Supper, 89, 91; the resurrection, 122; on future state, 132, 133; torments of hell, 137; restitution of all things, 138.
Ermangardus, i. 473.
Ernesti, i. 37; ii. 383, 385, 406, 498.
Erskine, Ralph, Eben., John, ii. 431, 433.
Erzberger, ii. 324.
Eschatology, i. 368, 213, ii. 119, 370, 509, 517; and art, 121; revision of, 522.
Eschenmayer, ii. 400.
Essays and Reviews, ii. 424, 429.
Ess: see *Van Ess.*
Essentia, i. 264.
Estius, ii. 280.
Eternal generation, i. 250, ii. 335: see *Generation.*
Eternal life, ii. 517.
Eternal punishment, i. 224, ii. 138, 519: see *Eschatology.*
Eternity of God, i. 445.
Etherius, ii. 37.
Ethics, Christian, ii. 405; in England, 417; separated from theology, 150.
Ethnicism, i. 54.
Εὐαγγέλιον, i. 85.
Eucharist, i. 204, 361, ii. 89: see *Lord's Supper.*
Eucharistic Sacrifice, ii. 322.
Eudoxius, i. 272.
Eugene III., i. 456, 460.
Eugene IV., ii. 82, 110, 113, 114; on godfathers, 87.
Eulogius of Cæsarea, i. 298.
Eunomians, i. 255, 256; baptism of, 361.
Eunomius, i. 272, 328.
Eusebians, i. 252, 253: see *Arians.*
Eusebius of Cæsarea, on Artemon, i. 62; on Beryl, 132, on chiliasm, 215, 230, 251; his confession, 251; on the Son, 254–5; defense of Christ, 313; on the canon, 317; on inspiration, 320; on worship of angels, 339; on Lord's Supper, 365; on the three offices of Christ, ii. 50.
Eusebius, Bruno, ii. 96.
Eusebius of Dorylæum, i. 278.
Eusebius of Emisa, i. 231.
Eusebius of Nicomedia, i. 230, 231, 251.
Eustathius of Sebaste, i. 259.
Euthymius Zigabenus, i. 383, 385; on inspiration, 423; ii. 26.
Eutychianism, i. 229, 277, ii. 344.
Eutychius (Eustachius), 399: see *Bonaventura.*
Eutychus on resurrection, i. 372.
Evangelical Alliance, ii. 412.
Evangelical Party in England, ii. 423, 425.
Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, ii. 406.
Evangelium æternum, i. 423, ii. 119.
Evidences, the, i. 414, ii. 382, 424; English works on, 384: see *Apologetics.*
Evil, i. 137, 161 sq., 337; necessary, ii. 482: see *Theodicy, Providence.*
Exaltation, state of, ii. 351.
Exegesis, ii. 170, 383: see *Bible.*
Exegesis perspicua, etc., ii. 149.
Excommunication, ii. 299: see *Discipline.*
Exercise scheme, ii. 436.
Exiles, Marian, ii. 182.
Ex Omnibus, Bull, ii. 202.
Exorcism, ii. 341, 484.
Exorcistæ, ii. 115.
Expiation, ii. 500.
Extent of Atonement, ii. 351, 356–7: see *Atonement.*
Extreme unction, ii. 112, 325; repetition of, 113.
Ezra, i. 84.

Faber, ii. 147, 197, 198.
Faber, F. W., ii. 426.
Faber, G. S., ii. 422, 507, 519.
Fabri, ii. 481.
Facundus, i. 37.
Fairbairn, ii. 434.
Faith, i. 188, ii. 67, 281, 289; and baptism, 365; and philosophy, 454; and works, 503.
Fall of angels, i. 341, 343.
Fall of man, i. 159–167, 292, ii. 22, 255; narrative of, 162, 163: see *Sin, Adam*, etc.
Family sins, ii. 27.
Fareira, ii. 196.
Farel, ii. 318.
Farmer, Hugh, ii. 467.
Fasting, ii. 325: see *Ascetics.*
Fathers, collections on, i. 33; Platonism of, 51; theology of, 63.
Faucher, Le, ii. 274.
Faustus, i. 290, 306.
Fave, La, ii. 225.
Faye, Antoine la, ii. 175.
Feathers Tavern Assoc., ii. 422.
Febronianism, ii. 455, 512.
Feder, ii. 353.

Federal method, ii. 170, 173, 174.
Felix of Urgella, ii. 35, 37.
Felix culpa, ii. 54.
Felgenhauer, ii. 371.
Fell, ii. 468.
Fenelon, ii. 204, 205, 476.
Fenner, ii. 186.
Fermentarii, ii. 108.
Fern, Henry, ii. 297, 298.
Ferrier, ii. 433.
Festival of Conception, ii. 32: see *Immaculate.*
Feuardentius, ii. 199.
Feuerbach, ii. 411, 475, 488; on religion, ii. 462.
Feuerborn, ii. 288, 353.
Fichte, J. C., ii. 398 sq.
Fichte, I. H. ii. 400, 408; christology, 491, 521; on immortality, 521.
Ficinus, i. 415: see *Marsilius.*
Fides sola justificat, ii. 281, 284: see *Faith.*
Fides formata, informis, ii. 68; qua, quæ creditur, 68.
Fidus, i. 198.
Field, Rd., ii. 182, 187, 296.
Filioque, i. 263, 454.
Filius adoptivus, ii. 38.
Fines for punishment, ii. 111.
Final method, ii. 152.
Finney, ii. 445, 505.
Fire, purifying, i. 223, 373, ii. 126: see *Purgatory.*
Firmin, ii. 213.
Fischer, K. P., ii. 409.
Fish, a symbol, i. 199.
Fisher, see *Piscator.*
Fisher, Edward, ii. 431.
Fiske, W., ii. 440.
Fistulæ eucharisticæ, ii. 103.
Fitch, ii. 440.
Flacius, ii. 149; on sin, 261–2; on obedience of Christ, 358.
Flaccus Albinus, i. 387.
Flagellants, i. 411; ii. 52, 70, 84, 111.
Flamingians, ii. 209.
Flavel, ii. 183, 190.
Flathe, i. 384.
Fleas, when created, ii. 339.
Fleetwood on rebaptism, ii. 369.
Fleming, Caleb, ii. 421.
Fleming, Robert, ii. 192.
Flesh of Christ deified, ii. 344, 348.
Fletcher, John, ii. 393.
Flœrke, ii. 519.
Florence, councils, i. 454; ii. 88, 108, 110, 114, 128.
Florus, magister, ii. 56.
Fludd, ii. 194.
Fock on Socinianism, ii. 255, 350, 359.
Folioth, see *Robert of Melun.*
Follen, ii. 446.
Folmar, ii. 37, 39; on concomitance, 103.
Fomes, ii. 84.
Fonseca, ii. 280.
Forbes, Alex., ii. 427.
Forbes, Wm., ii. 186, 285.
Forbes Case, ii. 423.
Foreknowledge, i. 191. See *Predestination.*
Forer, ii. 347.
Forerunners of Reformation, ii. 72, 75.
Form of Eucharist, ii. 324.
Formal Principle of Protestantism, ii. 141, 228.
Formula Consensus, ii. 164, 169, 180; on authority of Confessions, 250; extent of Redemption, 276; obedience of Christ, 358.
Formula Concordiæ, ii. 149, 164; de tertio usu legis, ii. 248; on symbols, 250; original sin, 258; Flacianism, 262; predestination, 272; universality of grace, 275; irresistible grace, 277; justification, 282; the Mass, 311; Lord's Supper, 316–20; the unio personalis, 347; against Æpinus, 352–3; active and passive obedience, 358.
Formula Μακρόστιχος, i. 253.
Formula Philippopolitana, i. 253.
Foscarari, ii. 196.
Foster, James, ii. 227.
Foster, John, ii. 423, 429.
Fox, George, ii. 217.
France, ii. 412; Roman Catholics in, ii. 454.
Francis of Sales, ii. 204; on eucharist, 224.
Franciscans, ii. 30, 280.
Francke, ii. 158, 376, 388.
Frank, Sebastian, ii. 154, 155, 284; on Scripture, 237; sin, 262; freedom, 271; creation, 339; redemption, 359.
Frankfort, Synod, ii. 37, 76.
Frassen, ii. 199.
Fratricelli, i. 384; ii. 119.
Fredegis of Tours, on inspiration, i. 425; creation, i. 470.
Frederick I., ii. 72.
Frederick III., Elector, ii. 149, 164.
Frederick the Great, ii. 379.
Frederick William II., ii. 389.
Free Church, Scotch, ii. 430.
Freedom, i. 155, 224, 293; ii. 18, 25, 268, 503.
Free-thinkers, ii. 220, 374.
Freidank, ii. 72.
Frelinghausen, J. A., ii. 378.
Frelinghuysen, ii. 451.
French Deists, ii. 380; materialists, 222; philosophy of, 415.
Fresenius, ii. 392.
Frey, ii. 464.
Friedlieb, ii. 152.
Friends of Light, ii. 410.
Friends, Society of, ii. 208, 216, 218; in America, 217.
Fries, ii. 402.
Fritzsche (Ahasv.), ii. 392.
Fronde, ii. 423, 426.
Fulgentius of Ruspe, i. 230, 238, 306, 334 ii. 109; on angels, i. 339.
Fuller, Andrew, ii. 423, 429.
Fuller, Thos., ii. 187.
Fullo. See *Peter.*
Fureiro, ii. 196.
Furness, ii. 442.
Füsslin, i. 384.

Gabler, ii. 409.
Gabriel, see *Biel.*
Gale, Theoph., ii. 183, 191.
Gallic Confession on Purgatory, 326, 327.

Gallitzin, ii. 459.
Galluppi, ii. 455.
Gansfort, see *Wessel*.
Garissol, ii. 181.
Gasparin, de, ii. 416, 469, 511.
Gass, on Protestant scholasticism, ii. 154; on Calixt, 158; on Calvin, 165; on Polanus, 172; on Arminianism, 216; on Calvin, 329; Luther's Christology, 350, 502.
Gassner, ii. 484.
Gastrell, Bp., ii. 213.
Gatti, ii. 199.
Gaunilo, i. 432, 434.
Gaup, ii. 407.
Gaussen, ii. 414, 416, 469.
Gay, ii. 441.
Gazzaniga, ii. 455.
Gelasius I., i. 309, 367.
Gemistius Pletho, i. 408.
Germanus, i. 379.
General Councils, first, i. 251; second, 252, 258; third, 275, 276; fourth, 276; fifth, 280; sixth, 282.
General and Special History of Doctrines, i. 25.
General Judgment, i. 373; ii. 124, 213, 221, 370, 373.
General and Special Providence, i. 336: see *Providence*.
Generation, eternal, i. 124, 257, 332, 463, ii. 335; see *Eternal*.
Genetic method of Oetinger, ii. 389.
Γέννησις, i. 265.
Geneva, *Catechism*, ii. 164, 168; church in, ii. 412.
Genii, i. 139.
Gennadius, i. 230, 237, 287, 408.
Gentiles, ii. 211.
Genus idiomaticum, apotelesmaticum, anchematicum (in Person of Christ), ii. 352.
Geoffrey of Vendôme, on extreme unction, ii. 113.
Georgii, i. 127.
Georgius of Laodicea, i. 255.
Gerardi, ii. 209.
Gerbert (Sylvester II.), i. 389; on Lord's Supper, ii. 89, 91, 92.
Gerhard, John, ii. 150, 152; on the fall, 264, 265; anthropology, 263; traducianism, 264; ordo salutis, 288; on creation, 339; christology, 352; offices of Christ, 353; on obedience of Christ, 357; on baptism, 365, 367.
Gerhard Groot, i. 410.
Gerhard Zerbolt, i. 431.
Gerhart, ii. 447.
German Catholicism, ii. 454.
German Reformed Theology, ii. 175.
German Reformed in America, ii. 443, 450.
Germany, Roman Catholics in, ii. 454.
Germar, ii. 468.
Geroch, ii. 39.
Gersen, i. 405.
Gerson, i. 402, 406, 423; on inspiration, 427; on knowing God, 440; theistic, 444; psychology, ii. 15; image of God, 20; on immaculate conception, 33; Lord's Supper, 101; on purgatorial fire, 126, 127.
Geruler, ii. 168.
Gibbon on Petavius, ii. 199.
Gibson, ii. 296, 297.
Gichtel, ii. 156, 301.
Gieseler, cited, i. 14, 39, 52, 58, 91, 192; on millenarianism, 215; on Julianists, 281; on Apocrypha, 318; on redemption, 348; on theories of Lord's Supper, 362; on Durandus, 399; on Ficinus, ii. 17; on seven sacraments, 79; works, 448.
Giessen Divines, ii. 351.
Gilbert of Poitiers, i. 391, 394: on Trinity, 457, 460.
Gilbert of Nogent, ii. 136, 137.
Gill, John, ii. 420.
Gillert, ii. 381.
Gillespie, Geo., ii. 185, 298.
Gillespie, Thos., ii. 431, 433.
Gioberti, ii. 455.
Gislebert on Jews, i. 383.
Gladstone, W. E., ii. 426.
Glarus, reform in, ii. 159.
Glas, John, ii. 431.
Glorified flesh of Christ, ii. 344, 348.
Γνῶσις, i. 98, 190.
Gnosis, *Gnosticism*, i. 20, 55, 58, 63, 75, 83, 136, 149, 165, 178, 213, 217, 223, 240, 330, 383, 390; ii. 122, 344.
Gnostics, classified, i. 58; on penalty, i. 112; on Logos, 118.
Gobarus, Stephen, i. 38.
Goch, i. 410.
God, attributes, i. 331, 445, ii. 335; being of, i. 98, 325, 432, ii. 333, 476; nature of, i. 327, 441; unity, 330.
Godfathers and Godmothers, ii. 87.
God-Man, i. 170, ii. 351: see *Christology*.
Gomarus, ii. 215, 274.
Gonet, ii. 199.
Good works: see *Works*.
Goode, W., ii. 184; on foreign orders, 296.
Goodwin, Thos., ii. 183, 190, 298.
Gorham Case, ii. 423, 427.
Görres, ii. 456.
Göschel, ii. 409, 502, 521.
Gospels, i. 44, ii. 489.
Gospels, spurious, i. 85
Gossner, ii. 456.
Göthe, ii. 513.
Gottfried of Vendôme, ii. 77.
Gottschalck, i. 383, ii. 56; on predestination, 57, 60.
Götze, ii. 381.
Government of World, i. 334, 469, ii. 337.
Grace, ii. 268 sq.; applied, 63; irresistible, ii. 277; want of, i. 193, 352, ii. 303, 513; and freedom, i. 301; ii. 507.
Gratia gratis dans, gratis data, gratum faciens, ii. 64, 65.
Gratian, ii. 97.
Gratry, ii. 458.
Grebel, ii. 209.
Greek Church, i. 454; in middle ages, 384, ii. 25; in Reformation era, 142, 206; in Russia, 459.
Greek Church on marriage, ii. 117; on transubstantiation, 107; on purgatory, 127, 128; the Scripture, 233, 234; on sacra-

ments (Conf. Arthod.), 203; on the mass, 211; the cup, 323; intermediate state, 327.
Greek language, revived, i. 4 11.
Green, Ashbel, ii. 445.
Gregg, ii. 470.
Gregory the Great, i. 230, 238; on Agnoëtism, 281; traducianism, 289, 290; on sin, 292; the fall, 292; sin and grace, 309; inspiration, 321; on councils, 324; on knowledge of God, 329; on worship of angels, 338; on death of Christ, 351; the church, 355; eucharist, 367; purgatory, 373, 375.
Gregory VII., i. 411; on Berengar, ii. 89, 91, 192.
Gregory XIII., ii. 199.
Gregory XV. on immaculate conception, ii. 263.
Gregory Nazianzen, i. 230, 232; on Holy Spirit, 258–9; on Trinity, 264, 270; on Apollinaris, 273; on sin, 293, 297; councils, 324; being of God, 325; attributes, 331; the Trinity in creation, 334; angels, 338, 341; redemption and the devil, 346; baptism, 358; Lord's Supper, 365; resurrection, 370; purifying fire, 374; future state, 376; heaven, 377; remission of punishment, 380.
Gregory of Nyssa, i. 230, 232; on dogma, 14; Holy Spirit, 258; procession of Holy Spirit, 263, 265; Trinity, 264; Apollinaris, 273, 281–2; traducianism, 288, 290; sin, 291, 293; conversion of devil, 342; redemption from devil, 346; extent of atonement, 351; baptism, 358; eucharist, 363; resurrection, 370; purgatory, 374; heaven, 377; future punishment, 379.
Gregory Thaumaturgus, i. 230, 245.
Gregory of Valentia, ii. 280, 347.
Gribaldi, ii. 211.
Griesbach, ii. 388.
Griffin, Ed., ii. 437, 445.
Griffin, George, ii. 445.
Grindal, ii. 182, 184.
Groningen School, ii. 413.
Groot, i. 410.
Groot, de, ii. 413.
Grossman, ii. 164.
Grotius, ii. 214–15, 222, 498; atonement, ii. 355, 360.
Grundtvig, ii. 412.
Gruner, J. F., ii. 383, 387.
Grynæus, ii. 164, 174.
Guardian angels, i. 139, 476.
Gubernatio generalis, specialis, i. 335.
Guder, ii. 503.
Guericke, ii. 453.
Guibert of Nogent, ii. 136, 137.
Guido de Bres, ii. 167.
Guitmund, ii. 96.
Guizot, ii. 414.
Gulielmus, see *William*.
Günther, ii. 454, 457.
Guntrad, ii. 91.
Gürtler, ii. 174.
Guthrie, ii. 435.
Guyon, Mdme. de, ii. 205.
Hackett, ii. 448.
Hades, i. 187, 221, 378, 376; ii. 520.
Hüfeli, ii. 412.
Haffenreffer, ii. 150, 152, 242, 339.
Hafner, ii. 414.
Hahn, A., ii. 397.
Hahn, J. M., ii. 518.
Haldane, ii. 415, 435.
Hales, see *Alexander*.
Hales, John, ii. 187.
Hales, Wm., ii. 422.
Halifax, ii. 227, 384, 418.
Half-way Covenant, ii. 192.
Hall, Bp. Jos., ii. 182, 188, 297, 298.
Hall, Robert, ii. 423.
Halle, school of, ii. 388.
Haller, ii. 160, 384.
Halyburton, ii. 192, 227.
Hamaan, i. 25.
Hamel, du, 199, 206, 280.
Hammerken, see *Kempis*.
Hamilton, Jas., ii. 425.
Hamilton, Sir Wm., ii. 433.
Hammond, Henry, ii. 186, 297, 298.
Hampden, R. D., ii. 427.
Hampden Controversy, ii. 423.
Hands, laying on of, ii. 114.
Hardenberg, Albert, ii. 149.
Hare, Julius C., ii. 428.
Harms' Theses, ii. 405.
Harmsen, see *Arminius*.
Hartenstein, ii. 409.
Hartley, David, ii. 422.
Harris, John, ii. 424, 429.
Hase, ii. 410, 514; cited, i. 16, 57, 58, 70; on Gregory of Nyssa, 232; Jerome, 235; scholasticism, 389; the Lombard, 395; on Eckart, 403; Hus, ii. 73; Nicolai, 381; Religion, 462; Trinity, 480; Christology, 494.
Hasenbroeck, ii. 413.
Hasenkamp, ii. 497, 502.
Hasse's Anselm, i. 393; ii. 46.
Hävernick, ii. 472.
Hawarden, ii. 213.
Hawks, ii. 449.
Hazelius, ii. 450.
Heaven, i. 224, 376; ii. 130.
Heathen, virtues of, ii. 256, 277.
Heathenism, history of, i. 20; forms of, 55.
Heber, Bp., ii. 425.
Hebraists, ii. 245.
Hebrews, Epistle, i. 318.
Heerbrand, Jacob, ii. 150, 152.
Hegel (and Hegelians), ii. 39, 407 sq., 469; on scholasticism, i. 407; on Anselm, 435; religion, 462; being of God, 477; Trinity, 480; sin, 485, 487; christology, 492; atonement, 501; freedom, 507; on sacraments, 516.
Hegel of Gera, on creation, ii. 339.
Hegesippus, i. 54.
Hegner, ii. 491.
Heidanus, ii. 170, 174, 176, 179.
Heidegger, H., ii. 168, 170, 173, 180, 300; on the fall, 264; on angels, 342; on creation, 339.
Heidelberg Catechism, ii. 164, 165, 175; on

extent of atonement, 275; faith, 284; sacraments, 305; the mass, 307; the Supper, 319; ubiquity of Christ, 346; atonement, 356–7; obedience, 357.
Heilmann, ii. 383, 386.
Heinich, John, ii. 152.
Heinrich, ii. 388; on Chemnitz, 151; Zachariæ, 386; Döderlein, 386, 387.
Heinrich's Rel. Phil., ii. 408.
Hell, i. 224, 376; ii. 130, etc.
Helldring, ii. 413.
Helmstädt Divines, ii. 288.
Helvetic Confessions, ii. 163, 164; on interpretation, 234, 235; creed of Damascus, 249; original sin, 258; freedom, 272; faith, 284; church, 292; the priesthood, 294; sacraments, 305; the mass, 311; purgatory, 326; Trinity, 330; communicatio idiomatum, 346; departed spirits, 370, 371.
Helvetius, ii. 379.
Hemmert, Van, ii. 467.
Hemming, Nicolas, ii. 152, 175, 176.
Hemmenway, ii. 438.
Henderson, Alex., ii. 182, 185, 429.
Henhofer, ii. 456.
Hengstenberg, ii. 406, 472.
Henke, cited, ii. 383, 387, 463, 468, 475, 486, 498, 504, 516, 518.
Hennel, ii. 475.
Henoticon, i. 280.
Henriciani, i. 384.
Henry VIII. vs. Luther, ii. 309.
Henry von Gent, i. 439.
Henry of Lausanne, i. 384.
Henry, Matthew, ii. 183, 191.
Heppe, on Haffenreffer, ii. 152; on Cocceius, 173; German Reformed Theology, 175; Keckermann, 176; Melancthon, 242.
Heraclius, i. 282.
Herbart and his school, ii. 409.
Herbert of Cherbury, ii. 222, 224.
Herder, ii. 401, 402, 464, 466, 472, 486, 519; on religion, 461; Spinoza, 475; life of Christ, 490; work of Christ, 498; predestination, 504, 506.
Heresiarch, i. 54.
Heresies, i. 19, 20; ancient, 52, 240; mediæval, 383; ii. 119.
Heresy and civil power, ii. 299.
Heretics, baptism of, i. 202. See *Baptism*.
Heringa, ii. 413, 467.
Hermas' Shepherd, i. 64, 134, 140, 141, 146, 191, 199.
Hermeneutics, ii. 247. See *Bible*.
Hermes, George, ii. 454, 456.
Hermes of Halle, ii. 389.
Hermogenes, i. 133, 135.
Heros of Arles, i. 298.
Herrnhut, ii. 391.
Herzog on Lutheranism and Calvinism, ii. 141.
Hess, ii. 412.
Hesse, ii. 149.
Hesshus, Tileman, ii. 149.
Hesychasts, i. 474.
Hetzer, ii. 211.
Heumans, ii. 514.
Hexaëmeron, i. 133.
Hey, ii. 418.
Heylin, ii. 187, 189, 296, 298.
Heyn, ii. 519.
Hibbard, ii. 448.
Hickes, ii. 183, 189, 296, 297.
Hickman, Henry, ii. 187.
Hickok, ii. 442, 447.
Hicksite Quakers, ii. 451.
Hierarchy, ii. 71.
Hierarchy of Angels, i. 338.
Hierarchia cœlestis, i. 477.
High Church, ii. 416; in England, 423.
Hilary of Arles, i. 269.
Hilary of Poitiers, i. 230, 235, 253; on Holy Spirit, 259; Trinity, 264; docetism, 271, 281; creatianism, 287; on the soul, 288; sin, 295; canon, 318; redemption, 349; Lord's Supper, 362.
Hildebert a Lavardino, i. 391, 394.
Hildebert of Maus, i. 429.
Hildebert of Tours, first used transubstantiatio, ii. 95, 96; on penance, ii. 110.
Hildebrand. See *Gregory VII.*
Hildebrand, Joachim, ii. 152.
Hildesheim chalice, ii. 99.
Hildreth, ii. 446.
Hilgenfeld, ii. 409, 410.
Hill, Geo., ii. 432.
Hillmer, ii. 388.
Hincmar Abp., ii. 56, 58.
Hippo, council, i. 317.
Hippolytus, philosophumena, i. 73; on under world, 223; on Trinity, 133; Antichrist, 217.
Hirscher, ii. 457.
History of Doctrines. See *Doctrines*.
Historical Christ, ii. 36, 344, 489.
Hitzig, ii. 473.
Hoadly, ii. 417, 516.
Hoard, ii. 187.
Hobart, Bp., ii. 449.
Hobart, Noah, ii. 448.
Hobbes, ii. 222, 224.
Hoch (Æpinus), ii. 351, 353.
Hochrütener, ii. 209.
Hodge, Charles, ii. 445, 448.
Höfling, ii. 517.
Hofmann, ii. 410, 472, 572.
Hofmann, Melchior, docetic, ii. 344, 348.
Hofstede de Groot, ii. 413.
חכמה, i. 115.
Holder, William, ii. 99.
Holdreth, ii. 475.
Holiness of God, i. 110.
Holland, ii. 214.
Hollas, D., 151, 153; on attributes, 335; on creation, 339; anthropology, 263; traducianism, 264.
Holy Ghost, i. 125, 258, 262, 453.
Holyoake, ii. 475.
Homilies, English, ii. 183.
Hommius, ii. 167.
Homousia, i. 245, 246, 251.
Homuncionitæ, i. 258.
Hondt, de. See *Canisius*.
Honorius, Pope, i. 283, 298.
Hook, on the succession, ii. 512.

Hooker Richard, ii. 182, 186, 296; Eccles. Polity, 185; on ordination, 297; baptism, 366.
Hooker, Thos., ii. 192, 298.
Hooker, ii. 182, 184.
Hopkins, Bishop of Vt., ii. 449.
Hopkins, Canon of Worcester, ii. 90.
Hopkins, Ezekiel, ii. 183, 190.
Hopkins, Samuel, ii. 436, 438.
Hopkinsianism, ii. 438.
Hormidas, i. 280.
Hornbeck, ii 170, 173.
Horne, Bp. Geo., ii. 419.
Hornejus, ii. 266.
Horsley, ii. 418, 421.
Hosius, i. 251.
Hossbach on Daunhauer, ii. 153.
Host, the, ii. 107, 323; elevation of, 100.
Hottinger, J H., ii. 174.
Hours of Devotion: see *Stunden d. Andacht*
Howe, John, ii. 183, 191, 333, 414.
Huber, Samuel, ii. 277, 279.
Hubert, ii. 199.
Hubmeier, ii. 209.
Hudson, C. F., ii. 451.
Hufnagel, ii. 386.
Hug, ii. 455.
Hugo of St. Caro, i. 424.
Hugo, St. Victor, i. 392, 394; on reason, 420; canon, 424; inspiration, 426; interpretation, 428, 429; being of God, 432, 435; omnipresence, 445, 446; unity of God, 448; omnipotence, 448, 450; the Trinity, 466, 469; creation, 470, 471, 472; angels, 475, 477; union of soul and body, creatianism, ii. 14; psychology, 15; on liberty, 18; image of God, 19, 20; freedom, 21; on sin, 23, 24; atonement, 46, 48; faith, 68; universal priesthood, 71, 72; sacraments, 76, 78; design of sacraments, 80, 81; transubstantiation, 96, 101; extreme unction, 112, 113; resurrection, 123; purgatory, 127.
Hülsemann, ii. 150, 152.
Hulsius, ii. 179.
Humanity of Christ, i. 173, 271, ii. 38, 485: see *Christology*.
Humanitarianism, ii. 331.
Humbert, Cardinal, Capernaitic, ii. 89, 94.
Hume, ii. 379, 395, 432.
Humiliation, state of, ii. 351.
Humphrey, H., ii. 440.
Hungarian Confession, ii. 164, 167. (Czengarina.)
Hunnius, ii. 219, 279.
Huntington, Joseph, ii. 451.
Huntington, Selina, ii. 425.
Huntington, Wm., ii. 425.
Hurd, Richard, ii. 384, 418.
Hus, John, i. 408, 409; on Scripture, 424; on indulgences, ii. 70; universal priesthood, 71, 73; on sacraments, 80; confirmation, 87, 88; the cup in the supper, 103; transubstantiation, 104, 106.
Husite Ware, ii. 103.
Hutcheson, ii. 432.
Hutchinson, Mrs. Ann, ii. 192.
Hutchinson, John, ii. 420.
Hutchinsonianism, ii. 416 420.
Hutter, Leonhard, ii. 150, 151.
Hydroparastates, i. 205.
Hymns, works on, i. 33.
Hymeneus, i. 53.
Hyperdulia, ii. 30, 74.
Hyperius, ii. 170, 171, 175; on allegorizing, 247.
Hypostasis of Son, i. 130, 243, 250, 264, 268.
Hypothetical universalism, ii. 180, 277.

Ἰχθυς, i. 199.
Iconium Synod, i. 202.
Iconoclasts, ii. 301: see *Images*.
Ideal and Historical Christ, ii. 36, 489.
Idealism, ii 399 sq.
Ἰδιότης, i. 264.
Ἰδιοποίησις, ii. 352.
Ignatius, and his epistles, i. 65; on Trinity, 119, 129; on redemption, 182, 194; on the church, 196; on Lord's Supper, 204–6.
Ignis purgatorius, i. 373: see *Fire*.
Ἱλάσμος, ii. 500.
Ildefonse of Toledo, i. 387.
Illuminati, ii. 380, 381.
Illuminatio, ii. 288.
Image-worship, i. 229, 239, ii. 75, 76, 301.
Image of God, i. 153, ii. 18, 20.
Imago, i. 290.
Imitation of Christ: see *Kempis*.
Immaculate Conception, ii. 29, 99, 262, 488: see *Mary*.
Immediate imputation, ii. 180, 181: see *Imputation, Sin*.
Immersion in Greek and Milan Church, ii. 85: see *Baptism*.
Immolatio, in the Lord's Supper, ii. 100.
Immortality, i. 155, 158, ii. 16, 251, 371, 519; arguments for, 521.
Immutability of God, ii. 477.
Impanation, ii. 104.
Imputation of sin, i. 155, 159, 180, 297, 299, ii. 26, 180.
Imputation of Christ's obedience, ii. 359: see *Justification*.
Incarnation (see *Christology*), i. 94.
Incarnation, without the Full, ii. 54, 363, 496.
Independency, works on, ii. 298; in England, 423, 431.
Indelible character of sacraments, ii. 80.
Indulgences, ii. 68, 70, 111, 126, 140, 325, 326.
In Eminenti, Bull, ii. 202, 280.
Infallibility, ii. 71.
Infralapsarianism, ii. 268, 274.
Infusio Gratiæ, ii. 63.
Infant baptism, i. 168, 198, ii. 84, 209, 210, 364, 513; in extremis, 369.
Infants, dying not baptized, i. 359.
Innocence, state of, i. 163, 286, ii. 17, 251.
Innocent, i. 298.
Innocent III., i. 475, ii. 49, 72: on Bible reading, i. 430; on indelible character, ii. 82; on transubtantiatio. 95, 197; on extreme unction, 112; on Mohammed, 120.
Innocency of Christ, i. 178: see *Sinlessness*.
Inquisition, i. 411.
Inspiration, i. 86, 319, 425, ii. 240, 467,

continuance of, i. 323; and revelation, ii. 245.
Intention, in sacraments, ii. 80.
Intermediate state, i. 221, ii. 130, 326, 520.
Internal Word, ii. 236.
Interpretation of Bible, i. 92, 319, 428, ii. 240, 467; free, 234; Swedenborg on, 472.
Invisible church, i. 354; ii. 299.
Invocatio, ii. 301, 341.
Irenæus, i. 63; works, 69, 85; on inspiration, 90; interpretation, 92, 94; tradition, 96, 97; penalty, 112; Trinity, 126; Logos, 122; creation, 133, 136; providence, 137; angels, 139, devil, 142; demons, 142, 143, 145; anthropology, 149; image of God, 153; freedom, 155; immortality, 159; fall, 165; Christology, 169, 172, 174; sinlessness of Christ, 178; redemption, 181, 184; the church, 193–4, baptism, 197; Lord's Supper, 204; last judgment, 213, 214, 216; intermediate state, 222.
Irresistible grace, ii. 277.
Irosius, i. 313.
Irving, Edward, ii. 414, 495.
Irvingites, ii. 510.
Isenbiehl, ii. 456.
Isidore of Seville, i. 230, 238; Sentences, 387; canon, 424.
Italian Philosophy, ii. 220, 221, 455.
Ith, ii. 486.
Ivo of Chartres, on extreme unction, ii. 113.

Jacob of Tagritum, i. 385.
Jacob de Theramo, ii. 53.
Jacobellus of Misa, on the cup, ii. 103.
Jacobi on adoptionism, ii. 36; Christology, 493.
Jacobi, F., ii. 401–2.
Jacobites, i, 241, 283, 385.
Jacobites (English), on rebaptism, ii. 369.
Jackson, Thos., ii. 182, 187, 296; on baptism, 366.
Jackson vs. Waterland, ii. 213.
Jahn, ii. 455.
Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theologie, ii. 410.
Jaldabaoth, i. 102, 143.
James, i. 47.
James, bellum papale, ii. 297.
James, Henry, ii. 447.
Janow, ii. 121.
Jansen, ii. 202.
Jansenism, ii. 201, 454, 457; on inspiration, 246; Lord's Supper, 323–4; predestination, 278, 280; sin, 263, 267.
Jarvis, S. F., ii. 449.
Jay, Wm., ii. 429.
Jebb, ii. 421, 425.
Jeffrey, Thos., ii. 225.
Jehosaphat, valley, ii. 124.
Jelf, ii. 426.
Jena, university, ii. 148.
Jeremiah, epistle, i. 318.
Jeremiah II., patriarch, ii. 207
Jerome, i. 229, 230, 235, 239; on Ebionites, 214; on Christ's body, 282; creatianism, 287; Pelagius, 298; canon, 317; inspiration, 322; providence, 335; devil, 342; resurrection, 369; the state of the lost, 376, 380.
Jerome of Prague, i. 408, 410; charged with tetratheism, i. 459; transubstantiation, ii. 104, 106.
Jerusalem, ii. 385; destruction of, i. 314; councils, i. 253; ii. 207.
Jesuits, ii. 197, 198, 203; theology of, 197 201; on inspiration, 246; Pelagians, 263, 267.
Jesus. See *Christ*.
Jetzer, ii. 33.
Jewel, ii. 182, 184, 195, 297; on baptism, 366; to Peter Martyr, ii. 185.
Jews, i 54, 382, 414–15.
Joachim of Flore, i. 423, 462, 465, 469; ii. 119
Joannes Monachus, i. 459.
Johannes a Cruce, ii. 205
John. See *Wesel*.
John. See *Ruysbrock*, *Montesono*.
John the apostle, i. 46, 48; on Logos, i. 116.
1 *John*, v. 7, ii. 421.
John Baptist, ii. 30.
John II., of Rome, i. 280.
John IV., i 283.
John XXII., as Antichrist, ii. 121; on sleep of soul, 129–30.
John of Antioch, i. 277.
John Ascusuages, i. 268.
John Cornubiensis (Cornwall) ii. 38.
John of Damascus, i. 28, 230, 280; ii. 346; on tradition, 421; Bible, 422; canon, 424; inspiration, 425; reading of Bible, 430; cosmological argument, 433; on knowing God, 438; attributes of God, 445; procession of Holy Ghost, 454; Trinity, 457, 458; creation, 471, 473; angelology, 475; anthropology, ii. 13, 14; immortality, 16; state of innocence, 18; image of God, 19; the fall, 23; original sin, 26; Christology, 35, 36, 38; redemption, 41, 42; predestination, 57; faith, 68; worship of the virgin, 75, of images, 76; sacraments, 79; transubstantiation, 108; end of the world, 120; resurrection, 124.
John Duns, Scotus. See *Scotus*.
John of Fidanza. See *Bonaventura*.
John of Jerusalem, i. 298.
John de Montesono, ii. 32.
John of Paris, on transubstantiation, ii. 104, 105.
John Philoponus, i. 268. See *Philoponus*.
John Picus. See *Mirandula*.
John of Salisbury, i. 395, 396; on reason, 420; tradition, 422; canon, 424; on the two swords, ii. 72.
John Scotus. See *Erigena*.
John Sigismund, ii. 168.
Johnson, John, ii. 183, 189
Johnson, Samuel, ii. 446, 448.
Jonas, ii. 147, 225.
Jones of Nayland, ii. 419.
Joris, ii. 211, 284.
Joseph, St., ii. 33.
Joseph II., Emperor, ii. 454.
Joseph II., patriarch, ii. 207.
Josephus on inspiration, i. 87.

Jouffroy, ii. 415.
Jovinian, i. 354.
Jowett, ii. 423.
Jubilee, ii. 70.
Judaism, i. 54, 382, 414, 415.
Jude, i. 47.
Judgment, ii. 124, 370: see *General*.
Julian, the Apostate, i. 313.
Julian (the Pelagian), i. 359.
Julian of Eclanum, i. 298, 299.
Julianists, i. 281.
Juliana of Liège, ii. 100.
Jung Stilling, ii. 394, 517.
Junilius, i. 335.
Junius, ii. 171.
Junkheim, ii. 506.
Junkin, ii. 505.
Jurien, ii. 279.
Jus Divinum, ii. 298.
Justice of God, i. 331, 452: see *Attributes*.
Justification, i. 190, ii. 63, 67, 251, 281, 354, 362, 503; controversy on, 149; in English Homilies, 183; Ossiander on, 286.
Justin, martyr, i. 63, 67, 76, 78, 79, 80, 85; on inspiration, 88; unity of God, 102, 104; attributes, 110, omniscience, 111; creation, 134; providence, 136; angels, 139, 140, 141; demons, 143; anthropology, 149; on freedom, 155; immortality, 158; sin, 160; the fall, 164, 166; Christ, 171; redemption, 180, 184; under world, 188, 189; Lord's Supper, 204, 206; last judgment, 213, 214; resurrection, 218; intermediate state, 222; annihilation of world, 224; heaven and hell, 224.
Justinian, i. 280.
Justitia originalis, i. 163, ii. 18, 25, 26, 28.

Kadser, ii. 513.
Kahins, ii. 453, 510; on Justin M., i. 127; on Luther, ii. 314.
Kala, i. 114.
Kant, i. 30, ii. 394, 463; on religion, 462; on Old Testament, 472; being of God, 476; on evil, 485, 486; christology, 489, 491; atonement, 496, 499; faith, 504; the church, 509; immortality, 517.
Kant's Philosophy, ii. 394 sq.
Karg, George, ii. 358; on active obedience, 362, 363.
Karrer, ii. 513.
Karsten, ii. 475.
Καταλλαγή, ii. 500.
Kantz, ii. 211.
Keble, ii. 414, 423, 426.
Keckermann, ii. 170, 172, 175, 176: christology, 352.
Keerl, ii. 481.
Keith, ii. 519.
Keller, ii. 456.
Kempis, Thomas à, i. 402, 405; imitation of Christ, 405, 406; on justification, ii. 69.
Ken, ii. 417.
Kennicott, ii. 419.
Κένωσις, ii. 351.
Kenrick, ii. 448, 459.
Kerner, ii. 484.
Κήρυγμα ἀποστολ., i. 52.
Kettlewell, ii. 183, 189, 417.
Kienlen, ii. 414.
Kieser, ii. 487.
Killen, ii. 435.
King, Abp., ii. 183, 189, 281.
King, Peter, ii. 298.
Kingdom of Christ, i. 368: see *Church*.
Kingsley, ii. 428.
Kipling, ii. 184.
Kirchner, T., ii. 144.
Kiss of Charity, ii. 514.
Kitto, ii. 428.
Klaiber, ii. 502.
Klausen on Ernesti, ii. 385.
Klebitz, W., ii. 149.
Klee, ii. 456; on ordination, 114; on spiritual knights, 88.
Κλῆσις, κλητοι, i. 194.
Kliefoth, i. 28.
Klopstock, ii. 38, 49.
Knapp, ii. 397, 498, 514.
Knight, Jas., ii. 213.
Knighthood, spiritual, ii. 87, 88.
Knipperdolling, ii. 209.
Knobel, ii. 473.
Knott, Ed. (see *Wilson*, Matthias), ii. 194.
Knowing God, i. 327, 328, 438.
Knowledge, Divine, sources of, i. 82, 315, 421, ii. 229.
Knox, John, ii. 167, 182, 185.
Knutzen, ii. 222, 380.
Koch: see *Cocceius*.
Kohlbrügge, ii. 508.
Κοινωνία τῶν θείων, ii. 352.
König, J. F., ii. 151, 153.
Körner, Christopher, ii. 169.
Köthen conference, ii. 411.
Krautwald, ii. 320.
Krudener, Madame de, ii. 415.
Krug, ii. 405, 499.
Krummacher, ii. 508.
Κρύψις, ii. 351.
Kristolatri, i. 281.
Kuhlmann, Quirinus, ii. 156, 300, 371.
Kuhn, ii. 456, 457.
Kunze, ii. 450.
Kurtz, ii. 479.

Labadie, ii. 177, 301; on Scripture, 236, 238.
Labadists, rebaptism by, ii. 369.
La Combe, ii. 205.
Lactantius, i. 230, 235, 243; christology, 244; on Holy Spirit, 258, 259; on traducianism, 287, 290; on sin, 291; on religion, 312, 315; De Ira Dei, 332; on evil, 337; on the devil, 342; the church, 355; chiliasm, 368; resurrection, 369; end of world, 373; future punishment, 376, 378.
Lady-Day, ii. 30.
La Faye, ii. 174, 225.
Lagus, ii. 165.
Laity and Clergy, ii. 114: see *Clergy*.
Lakermann on sin, ii. 266.
Lambeth Articles, ii. 182, 185; on reprobation, 281.
La Mennais, ii. 457
La Mettrie, ii. 379.

Lamson, ii. 442.
Lange, Joachim, ii. 372, 376, 507.
Lange, J. P., i. 25, 56; ii. 410, 463, 511; christology, 495.
Lange, K. R., ii. 514.
Lanfranc, i. 391; works, 392; on Lord's Supper, ii. 89, 94, 96.
Langres, synod, ii. 57.
Lankhard, ii. 380.
Laodicea, council, i. 317.
Lardner, ii. 226, 383, 421.
Laromiguière, ii. 415.
Lasaulx, Von, ii. 457.
Lasco, à, ii. 320.
Last Judgment, ii. 124, 370, 373.
Last Things, i, 368. See *Eschatology*.
Lateran councils, i. 283, 475; ii. 16.
Lateran IV., i. 442; ii. 97, 100.
Latimer, ii. 182, 183.
Latin Church, i. 454. See *Western*.
Latin language, i. 411.
Latitudinarians of England, ii. 178, 180, 183, 193, 410.
Latrobe, ii. 392.
Λατρεία, ii. 74.
Latrocinium Ephesinum, i. 278.
Latter Day Saints, ii. 452.
Laud, ii. 182, 187, 297.
Laurence, Rd., ii. 184, 416, 417, 421; on rebaptism, 369.
Laurentius Valla, i. 407.
Lavater, ii. 394, 412, 453, 470, 517, 520.
Law, Bp. Edmund, ii. 419.
Law, William, ii. 226, 227.
Lay Baptism, ii. 369.
Lay Confession, ii. 111.
Lazarus of Aix, i. 298.
Leade, Jane, ii. 178.
Le Blanc, ii. 178.
Lechler, ii. 397; on Wolf's Philosophy, ii. 377.
Lectores, ii. 115.
Lee, C., ii. 441.
Lee, Francis, ii. 194, 417.
Lee, Mother Ann, ii. 451.
Lee, Samuel, ii. 423, 428.
Lee, Wm., ii. 470.
Leechman, ii. 430, 432.
Leibnitz, theodicy, ii. 338, 340, 341; on union, ii. 219.
Leibnitz-Wolfian System, ii. 376.
Leighton, ii. 183, 189.
Leipsic Colloquium, ii. 169.
Leipsic Divines, ii. 288.
Leipsic Disputation (1827), ii. 406.
Leland, John, ii. 226, 227, 379.
Lempus depicts transubstantiation, ii. 92.
Leo Allatius, ii. 129, 207.
Leo of Acrida, ii. 108.
Leo Judæ, on sacraments, ii. 307.
Leo the Great, i. 230, 237; on Trinity, 267; Christ's body, 282; councils, 324; extent of atonement, 351; the church, 354; sacramentum, 356.
Leo III. i. 454.
Leo IX., ii. 92, 108.
Leo X., ii. 16.
Leonistæ, i. 384.
Leporius, i. 276, 281.
Leslie, ii. 183, 189, 384.
Less, G., ii. 384, 388.
Less, L., ii. 280.
Lessing, ii. 380, 381, 465; on perfectibility 464; Trinity, 480.
Lewes, ii. 424.
Lewis, Tayler, ii. 481.
Lex fomitis, ii. 84, 365.
Leydecker, ii. 170, 174, 279.
Leyden University, ii. 179.
L'Herminier, ii. 199.
Liber Concordiæ, ii. 146.
Liberty, ii. 18, 485. See *Freedom*.
Liberty and grace, i. 301. See *Grace*.
Libri ecclesiastici, i. 84, 317.
Lice, when created, ii. 339.
Lichtfreunde, ii. 410.
Liebermann, ii. 456.
Liebner, ii. 410, 494, 495; on Hugo St. Victor, ii. 26, 78, 81, 428, 435.
Light, created or uncreated, i. 474.
Lignon, Peter du, ii. 177.
Lilienthal, ii. 384.
Limborch, ii. 214, 215; on state of innocence, 254; grace, 270; faith, 285; the Supper, 321; atonement, 355, 362.
Limbus Infantum, Patrum, ii. 130.
Lindner, ii. 515.
Lindsey, ii. 421.
Lingard, ii. 459.
Littleton, ii. 226.
Liturgy for the Lord's Supper, ii. 323.
Livingstone, J. H., ii. 451.
Lloyd, Bp. Wm., ii. 298.
Localities of Future World, ii. 139.
Loci theologici, ii. 144, 150.
Locke, ii. 214, 223, 224, 423, 442.
Löffler, ii. 498.
Λόγος, i. 242.
Logos, Doctrine of, i. 113, 116, 117, 119, 123 125, 126, 130, 243, 247, 272, 851, 466 in Origen, 123.
Λόγος ἄσαρκος, ii. 351; ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικός, i. 116, 247, ii. 330; σπερματικός, i. 99, 116, 126, 188.
Lokwitz (Loquis), i. 410, ii. 120.
Λογοπάτωρ, i. 257.
Lollards, i. 409.
Lombard: see *Peter*.
London Synod, ii. 166.
Longinus, St., ii. 75.
Lope de Vega, ii. 205.
Lord, N., ii. 440, 519.
Lord's Supper, i. 203, 361, ii. 89, 164, 308, 513; consubstantiation, 309, 320; spiritual participation, 317, 318; symbolical, metabolical, 312; matter, form, and object, 323.
Lord's Supper, Greek Church on, ii. 107.
Löscher, ii. 144.
Lothaire II., i. 456.
Lothrop, ii. 440.
Lots, ii. 514.
Loudun Synod, ii. 181.
Louis of Bavaria, ii. 121.
Λουτρόν, i. 198.
Louvain University Controversies, ii. 278, 280

Love feasts, ii. 514, 543.
Low Church in England, ii. 423.
Lowman, Moses, ii. 225.
Lowth, Bp., ii. 419.
Love of God, i. 110.
Loyola, ii. 198.
Lucar, Cyril, ii. 206, 207.
Lucian, i. 313.
Lucidus, i. 306.
Lucifer, i. 477.
Lücke, i. 51, 124, ii. 406; on millenarianism, 120.
Lullus, i. 399, 421; on Trinity, 467; on incarnation, ii. 55.
Luther, on uncertainty of grace, ii. 65; theses, 139; a reformer, 140; his experience, 141; and Melancthon, 143; life and works, 144; Bible translation, 145; Articles of Smalcald, 146; Catechisms, 166, 168; Scripture, 230; interpretation, 235; on mystics, 236; inspiration, 241, 245; ceremonies, 249; on his own authority, 250; original rectitude, 252; the fall and original sin, 255, 256; traducianism, 264; bondage of will, 271–2; assurance, 277; the church, 292; priesthood, 293; on heresy, 299; number of sacraments, 304; transubstantiation, 309; on Henry VIII., 309; the mass, 310; Lord's Supper, 314, 317; confession, 325; Trinity, 329; on being of God, 334; on creation, 338; angels, 341; devils, 341–2; incarnation, 345; ubiquity, 346; christology, 350; atonement, 356; baptism, 367; infant baptism, 368.
Lutheranism, ii. 141, 149; controversies, 148–9; systematic theology of, 150 sq.; decrees, 268 sq.; the church, 293, 294, 452, 513; reformed, 157.
Lutheranism and Calvinism, ii. 141, 142, 149, 159, 160, 162; attempts at union, 218, 228, 229; decrees, 268; faith, 284; order of redemption, 288; worship, 290; ordination, 295; the Lord's Supper, 314 sq.; the host, 323; christology, 345; Christ's humiliation, 351; baptism, 364, 367.
Lutheran mysticism, ii. 154.
Lutheran Symbolical Books, ii. 146 sq.
Lutherans in America, ii. 443, 450.
Lütkemann, ii. 156.
Λύτρον, i. 179.
Lutz, ii. 472.
Lyons, canons of, ii. 30.
Lyons, council, i. 454.
Lyser, ii. 279.

Maccovius, ii. 170, 172.
Macedonian, i. 229, 258, 262.
Macdonald, ii. 435.
Macknight, ii. 432.
Maclaurin, ii. 432.
Macmahon, ii. 425.
Macnaught, ii. 470.
Macpherson, ii. 446.
Magdeburg Controversy, ii. 491.
Magee, Abp., ii. 421.
Magistracy, ii. 299.
Magnetism, ii. 482.
Mahan, ii. 445.
Maimbourg, ii. 200.
Maimonides, i. 427.
Maine de Biran, ii. 415.
Mainwaring, ii. 182, 187.
Maitland, ii. 428.
Major, George, ii. 148; on justification, 288.
Majorinus, i. 353.
Majus, Heinrich, ii. 144.
Makowsky: see *Maccovius*.
Μακρόστιχος *Formula*, i. 253.
Malachias, Abp. of Armagh, ii. 105.
מלאן יהוה, i. 115, 140.
Malakans, ii. 460.
Malan, ii. 415.
Maldonatus, ii. 197, 200.
Malebranche, ii. 221.
Malon, Bp., ii. 489.
Man, before the fall, i. 163, 286, ii. 17, 251.
Mandeville, ii. 223, 226.
Manichees, i. 160, 165, 240, 241, 295, 330, 333, 337, 342, 352, 383, 389, 470; ii. 43, 262; canon of, i. 317.
Manning, ii. 426, 459.
Mansel, ii. 424, 425.
Mant, Bp., ii. 418.
Μαντική, i. 87.
Manton, ii. 183, 190.
Manuel, ii. 33.
Manutius, Paul, ii. 196.
Manz, ii. 209.
Marathonius of Nicomedia, i. 262.
Marbach of Strasburg, ii. 272, 324.
Marburg Colloquy, ii. 309, 314.
Marcellus of Ancyra, i. 255, 257, 368; on Holy Spirit, 263.
Marchica Confessio, ii. 275.
Marcion, i. 58, 59, 85, 190.
Marcionites, i. 198.
Marck, J., ii. 178, 179.
Maresius, ii. 170, 173, 213.
Marheineke, i. 195, ii. 407, 409; on Montanus, i. 60; on baptism, ii. 364; on Trinity, 480; atonement, 501; justification, 504.
Marian exiles, ii. 298.
Marino, ii. 196.
Mariolatry, ii. 75, 198: see *Mary*, *Saints*.
Maronites, i. 241, 284.
Marsh, Bp. H., ii. 385, 420.
Marsh, James, ii. 446; on sin, 488.
Marsilius Ficinus, i. 383, 390, 407, 408, 415, ii. 17.
Martensen, ii. 410, 514, 516; on the devil, ii. 484; christology, 495.
Martin Marprelate Tracts, ii. 186.
Martin I., i. 283.
Martineau, Harriet, ii. 424.
Martineau, Jas., ii. 422.
Martini, Rudolph, ii. 176, 211, 331.
Marriage, of angels, i. 146; priests, ii. 116; see *Matrimony*.
Marrow Controversy, ii. 430, 431.
Martyr, Peter, ii. 170; creatianism, 264; in England, 185.
Martyrs, i. 180, 198.
Marum, abbot, i. 284.
Mary, the Virgin, i. 171; mother of God,

275; immaculate conception, ii. 29; partus virgineus, 40; worship of, 74; intercessor, 75; psalter of, 75. See *Immaculate Conception.*
Maskell, ii. 426.
Mason, Francis, ii. 297.
Mass, ii. 100, 294, 308, 310, 373; sacrifice of, 95; in Heidelberg Catechism, 165.
Masses for the dead, ii. 126; private, 326.
Massilienses, i. 306.
Master. See *Eckart.*
Mastricht, ii. 178, 179.
Material Principle of Protestantism, ii. 141.
Materialism, ii. 222, 475.
Mather, Cotton, ii. 192.
Mather, Increase, ii. 192.
Mather, Rd., ii. 192.
Mather, Samuel, ii. 438.
Matrimony, ii. 325; as a sacrament, i. 356; established in Paradise, ii. 117.
Matter, i. 58; eternity of, 135.
Matter of the eucharist, ii. 324.
Matthias of Janow, ii. 71, 73.
Matthias, W. B., ii. 184.
Maurice, ii. 428, 503.
Maurus. See *Rabanus.*
Maximus, i. 283.
Mayhew, ii. 437, 449.
Mayo, Rd., ii. 213.
Maywahlen, ii. 503.
Maxcy, ii. 449.
McCosh, ii. 433.
McCrie, ii. 434.
Mead, ii. 468.
Means of Grace, i. 352; ii. 303, 513. See *Grace.*
Meaux, council, ii. 87.
Mede, ii. 468.
Mediæval Art, ii. 121.
Mediate imputation, ii. 180, 181.
Megapolensis, ii. 451.
Megetius, ii. 36.
Meier on Arius, i. 250; Hilary, 260; Tritheism, 268; Wessel, 410.
Meier, Sebastian, ii. 160.
Melancthon, ii. 143; works, 145; confession of faith (Augsburg), 146; controversies, 148, 175; and Greek church, 207; inspiration, 242; original sin, 256; freedom, 272; assurance, 277; the word sacrament, 303; number of sacraments, 303; Trinity, 329; being of God, 334; preservation, 340; atonement, 355.
Melancthon's Loci, i. 29.
Melchiades, ii. 87.
Melchisedekites, i. 60.
Meletius, i. 14.
Melito, of Sardis, i. 108.
Melville, Andrew, ii. 182, 185.
Memmon, i. 277.
Memra, i. 116.
Menander, i. 54.
Mendelssohn, ii. 476.
Menius, ii. 209.
Menken, ii. 496, 497, 502.
Mennas of Constantinople, i. 230.
Menno Simonis, ii. 209; docetism of, 344, 348.
Mennonites, ii. 209; confession of, 209; on Scripture, 237; sacraments, 303; washing of feet, 305; Lord's Supper, 309, 315; baptism, 364, 367; rebaptism, 369.
Menzer, ii. 353.
Mercy of God, i. 110.
Merit, i. 189; ii. 67, 282.
Meritum ex condigno, ex congruo, imputativum, ii. 68, 69.
Merle d'Aubigné, ii. 414, 416.
Messiah, i. 117, 118.
Mestrezat, ii. 279.
Metabolical view of the Supper, i. 211; ii. 312, 362.
Μεταβάλλεσθαι, ii. 109.
Μεταποεῖσθαι, ii. 109.
Metempsychosis, ii. 517, 519.
Method of treating History, i. 24.
Methodism, ii. 391, 393, 487, 504; in America, 443, 449; on predestination, 508.
Methodius, i. 230, 294, 368, 369; on Origen, 333.
Meyer, ii. 518.
Miall, ii. 429.
Michael Cerularius, ii. 108.
Michael de Plaçois, ii. 51.
Michaëlis, ii. 383, 385, 481, 498.
Michelet, C. L., ii. 408.
Middle Ages, works on, i. 40.
Miehl, ii. 455.
Migration of souls, ii. 519.
Milan church, ii. 185.
Miles, J. W., ii. 447.
Militant church, ii. 291.
Mill, ii. 383.
Mill, James, ii. 423, 424.
Mill, John Stuart, ii. 423, 424.
Mill, W. H., ii. 429.
Millennarianism, i. 60, 213, 368; ii. 119, 370, 519. See *Christian.*
Miller, H., ii. 434.
Miller, Samuel, ii. 445.
Miller, William, ii. 451.
Milman, Dean, ii. 423, 428.
Milner, John, ii. 458.
Milton, ii. 183, 194, 214, 298.
Ministerium, ii. 294.
Ministry, Protestant, ii. 295.
Minnesingers, ii. 75.
Minucius Felix, i. 63; works, 69, 76, 79, 103, 105, 137, 143, 144, 155, 171; resurrection, 218, 219; eschatology, 226.
מקרא יהוה, i. 194.
Miracles, i. 314, 414; ii. 467; in early church, i. 80.
Miracle-Plays, ii. 53.
Mirandula, John Picus, i. 407, 408.
Mislenta, ii. 267.
Missa, i. 367.
Missale Romanum, ii. 197.
Missionary Societies, ii. 406.
Modalism, i. 131, 246. See *Sabellianism.*
Modetus, ii. 168.
Moderates, Scotch, ii. 430.
Mogilas, Peter, ii. 207.
Mohammed, as Antichrist, ii. 120.
Mohammedanism, i. 382, 414; ii. 206.
Möhler, i. 18; ii. 456; on allegorising, i. 93

Clement, 121; Justin Martyr, 141; Apollinaris, 274; Anselm, 434, 435; justification, ii. 282.
Molanus, abbot, ii. 219.
Moleschott, ii. 475.
Molina, ii. 202; on predestination, 278, 280; his Spiritual Guide, 288.
Molinæus. See *Moulin*.
Molinos, ii. 204, 205.
Momiers, ii. 415, 453.
Momma, ii. 174.
Monads, ii. 340.
Monarchianisms, i. 60, 117, 130.
Monas, i. 247.
Monasticism, i. 305, 411.
Moneta, ii. 17, 122, 128.
Monographs, historical, ii. 406.
Monophysitism, i. 20, 229, 241, 277–282, 385.
Monotheism, i. 330.
Monothelites, i. 229, 241, 282; ii. 35.
Montagu, ii. 182, 187.
Montaigne, ii. 222.
Montanus, Montanism, i. 60, 96, 194, 209, 216, 236.
Monte-Mayor, Prudentius de, ii. 280.
Montesono. See *John de*.
Moral Argument for Being of God, i. 432; ii. 477.
Moral Attributes, i. 452. See *Attributes*.
Moral Interpretation, ii. 467.
Moravians, ii. 391, 509, 513.
More, Hannah, ii. 425.
More, Henry, ii. 183, 193.
Morell, J. D., ii. 425.
Morgan (Pelagius), i. 296.
Morgan, Thos., ii. 226.
Morison, James, ii. 432.
Mörlin, Joachim, ii. 149, 363.
Mormons, ii. 443, 452.
Mortal sins, ii. 23, 25; Protestant view, 262.
Mortality, ii. 29.
Morton, Thos., ii. 296.
Mors æterna, ii. 354.
Morse, ii. 441.
Morus, S. F. N., ii. 383, 387, 498.
Mosaic account of Creation, i. 332, 470; ii. 338, 481.
Moscorovius, catechism, ii. 212.
Moses Maimonides, i. 427.
Mosheim, i. 72; ii. 377, 448.
Mother of God, i. 275.
Moulin, Peter du, ii. 180, 182, 279.
Mozarabic Liturgy, ii. 26.
Mozley, ii. 428, 507.
Muhlenberg, ii. 450.
Müller, Geo., ii. 413.
Müller, Heinrich, ii. 156.
Müller, Johannes von, on monks of St. Gall, i. 424.
Müller, Julius, ii. 410; on Augustine, i. 292; Augustine's view of freedom, 303; on sin, ii. 488; on freedom, 507.
Münscher, i. 27; on Tertullian, i. 109, note; Clement, 121; Marcellus, 258; Jerome, 380; sacraments of Old Test. ii. 82.
Münster Anabaptists, ii. 209.
Muntinghe, ii. 413.
Munus propheticum, sacerdotale, regium, ii. 353.
Münzer, ii. 209, 284; on church, 295.
Murdock, ii. 448.
Mursinna, ii. 383, 388.
Musculus, W., ii. 149, 170, 171; on baptism, 365.
Müslin. See *Musculus*.
Μυστήριον. i. 211; (sacramentum), ii. 117.
Muth, ii. 455.
Myconius, ii. 170; on Lord's Supper, 317.
Mysticism, mediæval, i. 401, 406, 412, 421, 427, 438, 442, 458, 470; ii. 13, 20, 26, 39, 47, 130, 138; Protestant, 154; Lutheran, 154, 155; Reformed, 177, 178; Roman Catholic, 203, 394, 515; on the internal word, 236; justification, 280; on the church, 300; Lord's Supper, 323; creation, 337; Trinity, 336; Christology of, 344; redemption, 355.
Mythology, works on, i. 20.
Myths, ii. 470.

Nares, ii. 384, 421.
Natalis (Noel), Alexander, ii. 199, 206.
Nature, philosophy of. See *Schelling*.
Natural Religion, ii. 424.
Naturalism, ii. 220, 378, 396.
Nature, book of, i. 421.
Nature of God, i. 327, 441. See *God*.
Nature of Christ, i. 229; ii. 35, 271, 277, 344. See *Christology*.
Nazarenes, i. 55, 56, 170; ii. 328, 344.
Neander, ii. 406, 448; cited, i. 15, 16, 18, 27, 39, 58, 88; on Bardesanes, 137; Origen, 250; Holy Spirit, 263; Philopeonus, 268; Chrysostom, 294; Pelagius, 298; on the Predestinatus, 306; church, 354; Augustine, 355; Pelagius and Augustine on baptism, 359, 360; theories of the eucharist, 363; Eusebius, 365; Athanasius, 365; Abelard, 417; Agobard, 426; Anselm, ii. 46, 61; Innocent III., 49; Wycliffe, 63; Scotus on eucharist, 91.
Neander, Michael, ii. 144.
Necromancy, ii. 452.
Nelson, ii. 213.
Nemesius, i. 230, 234; on preëxistence, 286; on creation, 335.
Neonomians, ii. 431.
Neoplatonism, ii. 375.
Nepos, i. 368.
Nestorius, i. 275.
Nestorianism, i. 20, 241, 275, ii. 35, 344, 363; on marriage, 117.
Netherlands, ii. 412.
Nevin, J. W., ii. 450.
Newcome, Bp., ii. 419.
New England, theology in, ii. 183, 192, 435.
Newman, John, ii. 459.
Newman, J. H., ii. 414, 423, 426.
Newton, Isaac, ii. 213, 421.
Newton, John, ii. 415.
Newton, Thos., ii. 383, 418.
Newtown Synod, ii. 192.
New School Presbyterians, ii. 444.
New Haven Theology, ii 436.
New Jerusalem Church, ii. 391.

Nice, council of, i. 251; second council, ii. 108.
Nicene Creed, i. 334, ii. 249, 329.
Nicetas Choniates, i. 385, ii. 36; on Trinity, i. 458. 463.
Nicetas Pectoratus, ii. 108.
Nicholas, Michel, on the Logos, i. 116.
Nicholls, ii. 225; on the church, 296.
Nicolai, ii. 381.
Nicolai, Melchior, ii. 353.
Nicolaitans, i. 54.
Nicolas, Aug., ii. 458.
Nicolas I., i. 454.
Nicolas Cabasilas, i. 402, 406.
Nicolas Clemangis, i. 423, ii. 73
Nicolas de Cusa, i. 423
Nicolas of Methone, i. 385, 439, 448, ii. 26; on Trinity, i. 458, immortality, ii. 16, 36; on redemption, 41, 42; on eucharist, 109.
Nicole, ii. 201, 202; on the eucharist, 324.
Niedner, i. 39, 389.
Nihil privativum, negativum, i. 470.
Nihilianism, ii. 35, 38.
Niles, N., ii. 439.
Nilus, i. 366.
Nitsch, G., on Scripture, ii. 245.
Nitzsch, C. J., ii. 406, 410, 477; on atonement, 500.
Noëtus, i. 60, 117, 131, 246.
Nogent, Guibert of, ii. 136, 137.
Non-Adorantes (Unitarians), ii. 212.
Non-Conformists, ii. 417.
Non-jurors, ii. 183, 189, 417.
Nominalism, i. 391, 457, 460, ii. 51.
Nordheimer, ii. 448.
Norris, ii. 183, 193, 225, 227.
Norton, Andrews, ii. 441, 448.
Norton, John, ii. 192.
Nösselt, ii. 384.
Νόθα, i. 317.
Notiones personales (Trinity), ii. 336.
Novalis, ii. 491.
Novatian, i. 71, 106, 108, 131, 171, 172, 352; controversy, 194.
Novum Testamentum, Instrumentum, i. 89.
Noyes, G. R., ii. 448.
Nye, Philip, ii. 298.

Oakley
Oaths
Oblations, i. 209.
O'Brien, Bp., ii. 505.
Occam, i. 399, 400, 401, 412; being of God, 432, 437; on knowing God, 440; on atonement, ii. 51; elevation of host, 100; transubstantiation, 104, 105.
Occasionalism, ii. 341.
Ochino, ii. 212; on satisfaction, 359.
Octavius, by Minucius Felix, i. 69.
Odo of Clugny, i. 424.
Odo of Cambray, ii. 15.
Œcolampadius, ii. 160, 170; on church discipline, 299; on Lord's Supper, 309, 314.
Œcumenical Councils: see *General*
Oegger, ii. 393.
Oetinger, ii. 388, 389, 39[illegible], on the Supper, 515.
Offices of Christ, ii. 357
Oil, in extreme unction, ii. 112. 113.
Oischinger, ii. 457
Olevianus, ii. 164, 175; christology, ii. 351, 352.
Olin, ii. 450.
Oliva, Peter, ii. 116.
Old Testament (see *Bible*), ii. 472; Protestant views on, ii. 248.
Olshausen, ii. 470.
Om, i. 114.
Omnipotence, i. 110, 332. 448: see *Attributes*.
Omnipresence, i. 110, 445.
Omniscience, i. 110, 332, 448; limited, ii. 335.
Ὁμοιούσιος, i. 255.
Ὁμολογούμενα, i. 317.
Ὁμοούσιος, i. 251, 253, 255.
Oncken, ii. 516.
Onderdonk, ii. 449.
Ὄνομα, i. 104.
Ontological Argument, i. 325, 432, 476.
Opera ad intra, extra, ii. 334.
Opera attributiva (Trinity), ii. 336.
Opera œconomica (Trinity), ii. 336.
Operationes Spiritus, ii. 288.
Ophites, i. 59, 143, 163.
Optatus of Mileve, i. 352, 353.
Optimism, ii. 341.
Opus, ex opere operantis, ex op. operato, ii. 80, 303, 306.
Opzoomer, ii. 413.
Orange, Synod, i. 306.
Orders, foreign, in Church of England, ii. 296.
Orders, sacrament, i. 356; ii. 114, 115, 325: see *Ordination*.
Ordination, matter and form, ii. 114; age of the ordained, 115; seven classes, 115; is indelible, 115.
Ordinatio vaga, ii. 295.
Ordo salutis, ii. 109, 288.
Origen, i. 28, 63; works, 72, 73, 81; on Ebionites, 56; on canon, 85; inspiration, 87, 90, 91; interpretation, 92; tradition, 98; God, 105, 107; omniscience, 110; justice, 112; Logos, 123; Holy Spirit, 128; Trinity, 130, 132; creation, 133, 135; angels, 139; demons, 143; on restoration of Satan, 146; anthropology, 150; preëxistence, 151; image of God, 153; on freedom, 155; immortality, 158; on sin, 160; on the fall, 162, 165; on Christ, 171, 174, 178; redemption, 181, 185, 186; predestination, 188, 191; on the church, 195, infant baptism, 198; millennium, 217; resurrection, 220; purifying fire, 223; future state, 224, 226; Christ's glorified body, 282.
Origenism, fate of, i. 229, 239, 243, 246, 318, 333.
Origin of Soul, i. 151: see *Creationism*, *Traducianism*.
Original Righteousness, ii. 251.
Original Sin (see *Sin*), i. 293, 301, 40 255, 364, 485, 487, 547; Flacian versy, ii. 149; Edwards on, 4[illegible]
Original Sin and Baptism, ii. [illegible] 160
Orosius, i. 298, 344.
Orthodox Church: see *Greek*

Orthodoxy, ancient, i. 228.
Osgood, S., ii. 441.
Osiander, Andrew, ii. 149.
Osiander, L. ii. 150, 353; on atonement, 362; on water of baptism, 367; on justification, 286.
Osterwald, ii. 377.
Osterzee, Van, ii. 413.
Ostiarii, ii. 115.
Ostorodt, ii. 210; on Scripture, 240; on the Supper, 321; Christology, 349.
Ott, ii. 209.
Otto, Bp. Bamberg, ii. 72; on number of sacraments, 78.
Otto (Emperor), ii. 72.
Οὐσία, i. 264, 267.
Overall, ii. 186, 296.
Overton, ii. 184.
Owen, John, ii. 183, 191, 298; on universal redemption, 357.
Owen, J. J., ii. 448.
Owen, Robert, ii. 426.
Oxford Council, on Bible reading, i. 430.
Oxford Essays and Reviews, ii. 424, 429.
Oxford School, ii. 412, 414, 423; on purgatory, 520.
Oxlee, ii. 422.

Pædobaptism: see *Infant Baptism*.
Paine, Thos., ii. 384.
Pajon, ii. 180, 181, 277, 279.
Palamas, i. 474.
Paley, ii. 384, 419, 477.
Palfrey, ii. 441.
Pallavicini, ii. 195.
Πάλις, i. 224.
Pamphilus of Cæsarea, i. 230.
Paneitas, ii. 104.
Pantheism, i. 132, 441; ii. 47, 64, 132, 220, 222, 337, 399, 474, 475, 481.
Pantheras, i. 171.
Papacy, ii. 71, 74, 412; as a state, 299.
Papal Decretals, i. 32.
Papias, i. 66, 213.
Paracelsus, ii. 154, 155, 324.
Paraclete, i. 125.
Παράδοσις, i. 52, 63.
Paradise, i. 224, ii. 132.
Pareus, ii. 218.
Paris Councils, i. 442, ii. 32, 99, 166.
Paris University, ii. 32.
Park, E. A., ii. 445.
Parker, Abp., ii. 182, 184.
Parker, Samuel, ii. 419.
Parkhurst, ii. 419.
Παρουσία, i. 213.
Particular churches, ii. 299: see *Independency*.
Particularism of Grace, ii. 180, 276: see *Atonement*.
Partus virgineus (of Mary), ii. 40.
Pascal, ii. 201, 203.
Paschasius Radbert, ii. 40; on sense of Scripture, i. 429; on sacraments, ii. 77; on Lord's Supper, 89, 90, 92.
Passaglia, ii. 455.
Passive obedience, ii. 354, 357, 358, 362, 497, 498
Pastoris, Adam (Martini), ii. 331.
Paterini, i. 384.
Patrick, St., on Purgatory, ii. 127.
Patrick, Bp. Symon, ii. 183, 194.
Patripassians, i. 131, 248, 255.
Patrology, i. 18, 34.
Paul, works on, i. 46, 47; on Logos, 117; on resurrection, 218.
Paul III., ii. 148.
Paul V., ii. 280.
Paul of Samosata, i. 246, 248; revived, ii. 211.
Paulicians, i. 240, 384, 430.
Paulinus, i. 296.
Paulus, H. E. G., ii. 398, 406.
Paulus Orosius, i. 298.
Payne, Geo., ii. 424, 429.
Peabody, ii. 441.
Pearson, ii. 183, 189, 384; on baptism, 366; on the descent to Hell, 354.
Peccatum, i. 292.
Peccatum, originale, originans, ii. 264; originale, actuale, 265. See *Sin*.
Pedagogics, modern, ii. 486.
Πηγη θεότητος, i. 455.
Pelagianism, i. 229, 240, 241, 287, 296, 305, 352, 359; ii. 201, 259, 268, 485, 505.
Pelagius, i. 296; on baptism, 359; creationism, 287; eternal punishment, 376.
Pellicia, ii. 456.
Penance, first and second, i. 189; ii. 70; as a sacrament, 109; matter and form of, 110, 325.
Penn, Wm., ii. 217.
Penny-preachers, ii. 70.
Pepuzians, i. 60.
Perfectibility, ii. 463.
Perfectionism, ii. 442.
Περιχώρησις, ii. 35, 346.
Periods in History of Doctrines, i. 26; Neander and Baumgarten—Crusius on, 27; Rosenkranz, 28; Klieforth, 28.
Perkins, Wm., ii. 182, 185.
Perseverantia, ii. 288.
Persons. See *Trinity*.
Perrone, ii. 454, 489.
Persona, i. 264.
Petavius, ii. 197, 199, 213, 347.
Peter, the apostle, i. 46; his successors, 196; his swords, ii. 71, 72.
Peter of Bruys, i. 384; on infant baptism, ii. 84.
Peter of Callinico, i. 268.
Peter of Cluny, i. 383; ii. 85.
Peter Damiani, ii. 75.
Peter Fullo, i. 280.
Peter Lombard, i. 392, 394, 395, 435; on omnipotence, 448; Trinity, 457, 462; creation, 471; angels, 476; creationism, ii. 14; state of innocence, 18; image of God, 20; original sin, 27, 28; freedom, 28; sinlessness of Mary, 31; nihilianism, 35, 38; atonement, 47, 49; election, 60, 61; on grace, 64, 65; faith, 68; the Latria, 76; sacraments, 76, 78, in Old Testament, 81; on grace of baptism, 84, 86; Lord's Supper, 98, 100; withholding the cup, 103; penance, 109, 110, 111; extreme

unction, 112, 113; ordination, 114; matrimony, 116, 117; resurrection, 123; the judgment, 126; purgatory, 127; heaven, 133; hell, 137.
Peter Martyr Vermilius, ii. 170. See *Martyr*.
Peter Mogilas, ii. 207.
Peter Oliva, ii. 116.
Peter of Poitiers, i. 395, 435.
Petrus Siculus, i. 424, 430.
Peter the Venerable (of Cluny), i. 383; ii. 85.
Petersen, Wm., ii. 370. 371.
Petilianus (Donatist), ii. 361.
Petrobrusiani, i. 384.
Peucer, Caspar, ii. 149.
Peyrere, ii. 263.
Pezel, ii. 175, 176.
Pfaff, chancellor, ii. 377, 384, 509.
Pfeffinger, John, ii. 148.
Phenomenal Method, ii. 153.
Philetus, i. 53.
Philanthropy, ii. 485.
Philip, Landgrave, ii. 218.
Philippi, F. A., ii. 410, 502.
Philippists. See *Melancthon*.
Philippopolis, synod, i. 253.
Philo, i. 50; on interpretation, 92; inspiration, 88; omnipresence, 110; Logos, 114, 115, 117; angels, 140; demons, 145.
Philopatris, i. 313.
Philoponus, i. 268.
Philosophy, history of, works on, i. 21; oriental, 113; scholastic, 406; modern, ii. 220, sq.; in Italy, 220, 455; in England, 423; in Germany, 376, 394, sq., 398; in Scotland, 430; United States, 447.
Philosophy and Theology, ii. 375.
Philosophumena of Origen, i. 73.
Philostorgius, i. 328.
Philoxenus (Xenaias), i. 281.
Philpotts, Bp., ii. 427.
Photinus, i. 253, 255, 257, 263; ii. 328.
Photius, i. 244, 454, 455.
Phthartolatri, i. 281.
Φθόρα, i. 281.
Physico-theological argument, i. 325; ii. 476.
Φυσις, i. 268.
Pictet, ii. 170, 178, 180.
Picus. See *Mirandula*.
Pierius, i. 244.
Pietists, i. 29; ii. 157, 288, 340, 388, 391, 485, 487, 496, 504, 515; on sin, 263, 267.
Piety, practical, ii. 404.
Pighius (Von Campen), ii. 197, 198.
Pilgrim's Progress, ii. 190.
Pilkington, ii. 182, 184.
Piscator, ii. 175, 176, 358; on active obedience, ii. 362, 363.
Πίστις, i. 98, 190.
Pistoris, Adam, ii. 211.
Pithopœus, ii. 165.
Pitra, ii. 36.
Pius V., on Bajus, ii. 202, 280.
Placœus, ii. 179, 180, 181; on sin, 261, 262.
Plaçois, Michael de, ii. 51.
Plan of Union, ii. 443.
Planck, ii. 386.
Platon, Abp, ii. 459.
Platonism, i. 273, 390, 408; ii. 16; of Fathers, i 51; English, ii. 183, 193.
Πλήρωμα, i. 222.
Pletho, Gemistius, i. 408.
Pliny to Trajan, i. 171.
Plymouthites, ii. 415.
Πνεύμα, i. 125, 149, 242; ii. 16.
Πνευματομάχοι, i. 258, 261, 263.
Pnoe, i. 149.
Pococke, Bp. Rd., ii. 419
Pœnitentia, ii. 288.
Poinet's Catechism, ii. 166.
Poiret, ii. 177, 300, 324; on faith, 287 christology, 350.
Poland, Unitarianism in, ii. 212.
Polanus, ii. 170, 172; on original rectitude, 253; creationism, 264.
Polemics, i. 228; in middle ages, 383.
Polyander, ii. 215.
Polycarp, i. 66, 189.
Polytheism, i. 330.
Pomerania, ii. 149.
Pond, Enoch, ii. 440.
Pope, as Antichrist, ii. 119; head of church, 290: see *Papacy*.
Pope's Essay, ii. 486.
Pordage, ii. 177, 178.
Porphyry, i. 313.
Porretanus (Porseta): see *Gilbert*.
Porson, ii. 421.
Port Royal, ii. 201, 202.
Posidonius on demons, i. 345.
Positivism: see *Comte*.
Potter, Abp., ii. 213, 296, 416, 417.
Powell, Baden, ii. 429, 471.
Power, ecclesiastical, ii. 290.
Practical Theology, ii. 404.
Præadamites, ii. 263.
Præscriptio, i. 96.
Prætorius, Abdias, ii. 152.
Pragmatic method, i. 24, ii. 386.
Praxeas, i. 60, 62, 117, 131, 346.
Prayers for dead, i. 375.
Predestinarians, i. 306.
Predestination, i. 188, 303, 332, ii. 165, 186, 268, 503; twofold, ii. 56; controversies on, 277: see *Decrees, Election, Reprobation*.
Predestinatus, the work, i. 306.
Preëstablished harmony, ii. 340.
Preëxistence, i. 151, 286. ii. 215.
Prelacy, works on, ii. 297, 298.
Presbyterian Government, works on, ii. 298.
Presbyterianism in England, ii. 169, 182; Scotland, 431; America, 169, 444.
Presbyters, ii. 115.
Preservation of world, i. 334. ii. 337, 481.
Preston, John, ii. 185.
Pressensé, Ed. de, ii. 416.
Pretyman: see *Tomline*.
Prevenient grace, ii. 64.
Price, Rd., ii. 422.
Prideaux, ii. 298.
Priesthood, ii. 71; universal, 290; spiritual, 300.
Priestley, ii. 421; eschatology, 520.
Priests, i. 211; marriage of, ii. 116; age of ordination, ii. 114.
Primacy of Rome, i. 196, 352.

Prince, Thomas, ii. 437.
Principles of Protestants, ii. 140.
Prinsterer: see *Van.*
Printing, i. 411.
Priscillian, i. 240, 241.
Priscillianists, i. 333.
Private Confession, ii. 325.
Private Masses, ii. 326.
Προβολή, i. 249.
Procession of Holy Spirit, i. 262, 463: see *Holy Spirit, Trinity.*
Procopowicz, ii. 459.
Prohibited degrees in marriage, ii. 116.
Prohibition of Bible, i. 430.
Prolegomena, first used, ii. 151.
Proofs of Being of God, ii. 475, 477: see *God.*
Prophecy, i. 77, 314, 414, ii. 467, 518; works on, 472.
Prophets of Zwickau, ii. 154, 155, 209.
Proprietates Dei, ii. 335: see *God.*
Proprietates personales (Trinity), ii. 335.
Prosper of Aquitaine, i. 230, 237, 298, 306.
Προσκύνησις, ii. 74.
Προσρήσις, i. 104.
Protest of New School, ii. 444.
Protestant Doctrines out of Germany, ii. 412, 416.
Protestant Friends, ii. 410, 465.
Protestantism, principles of, ii. 140, 142; confessions, 146 sq., 162 sq.,; influence on Rome, 196, 201; formal and material principles, 228; characteristic doctrines, 229 sq.; on tradition, 248; on man before the fall, 251; sin, 255 sq.; justification and works, 281 sq.; the church, 289 sq.; ecclesiastical power, 290; the ministry, 295; independence of church, 299; on worship of saints, etc., 301; sacraments, 303; the mass, 308; christology, etc., 344; atonement, 354 sq.; baptism, 364.
Protestantism vs. Romanism, ii. 229 sq., 244 sq., 251 sq., 281 sq., 289 sq., 303 sq., 308 sq.
Protestants, on union with Catholics, ii. 218.
Protoplast: see *Adam, Fall.*
Providence, i. 136, 334, 469, ii. 337, 340, 481.
Prozymites, ii. 108.
Prudentius on preëxistence, i. 286; on resurrection, 371.
Prudentius of Troyes, ii. 56, 58.
Psalm Books, i. 32.
Psalterium Beatæ Virginis, ii. 75.
Pseudo-Ambrosius, i. 365, ii. 96.
Pseudo-Clementina: see *Clementine.*
Pseudo-Dionysius, i. 67, 329; on the celestial hierarchy, 338, 341; the church, 355; sacraments, 355; the Trinity, 458.
Ψυχή, i. 149, ii. 16.
Psychology, i. 149; of scholastics, ii. 13.
Psychopannychy, ii. 129, 370, 372, 514: see *Thnetopsychites.*
Puaux, ii. 416.
Publicani, i. 384.
Puffendorf, ii. 377.
Pulleyn, Robert, ii. 14, 65; on the conception of Christ, 41; the atonement, 47, 49; on the cup, 102.
Pungens-asinum, Johannes, ii. 104.
Pura naturalia, ii. 19.
Purgatory, i. 221, 273; ii. 126, 289, 326 520; site of, ii. 130.
Purifying fire, i. 373; ii. 126.
Purists, ii. 245.
Puritans, ii. 182, 183; ancient, i. 352.
Pusey, ii. 414, 423, 426; his school, 412, 414, 465, 510, 513.
Pyrmont, Quakers in, ii. 217.

Quakers, ii. 208, 216, 218, 451; in America, 443; on clergy, 291; the church, 295; sacraments, 303; Lord's Supper, 309; christology of, 344; on redemption, 355, 362.
Quenstedt, ii. 151, 153; on creation, 339; on providence, 341.
Quesnel, ii. 201, 202, 203, 269.
Quicunque, symbol, i. 269.
Quiercy Synod, ii. 56, 60.
Quietists, ii. 204, 205.
Quietists (Greek), i. 474.
Quintilla, i. 202.

Rabanus Maurus, i. 429; ii. 36; on predestination, 56, 57; sacraments, 77; baptism, 86; Lord's Supper, 89, 91.
Rabbins, i. 426.
Racovian Catechism, ii. 210, 212; on interpretation, 234; freedom and grace, 271; the Supper, 320; on person of Christ, 349, 350; atonement, 360.
Radbert, on virginity of Mary, ii. 30. See *Paschasius.*
Radical evil (Kant), ii. 486.
Raimund Lullus, i. 399. See *Lullus.*
Raimund Martini, i. 383; ii. 17.
Raimund of Sabunde, i. 399; on revelation, 423; being of God, 432, 436; the Trinity, 467; immortality, ii. 16, 17; freedom, 22; sacraments, 79; orders, 114.
Rainerius, i. 431.
Ramus, Peter, ii. 170, 171.
Randolph, Thos., ii. 333.
Rascolniks, ii. 460.
Ratio ac forma, etc., ii. 298.
Rationalism, ii. 210, 222, 378, 385, 395, 397, 404, 407, 463, 468, 474, 506, 509, 515; on Scripture, ii. 239; Christology of, 489, 490; atonement, 496.
Rationalistic Reaction, ii. 410.
Rationalismus vulgaris, ii. 397, 410.
Ratramn, i. 454; ii. 40; on virginity of Mary, 30; predestination, 56, 58; on Lord's Supper, 89, 90, 92.
Rauch, ii. 447.
Ravenscroft, ii. 449.
Reading of Bible, i. 428. See *Bible.*
Real Presence, i. 207; ii. 309, 316.
Realism, i. 391, 460.
Reason and Revelation, i. 416; ii. 463.
Re-baptizing, ii. 86, 364, 369.
Recared, i. 264.
Rectitude, primitive, ii. 17. See *Innocence.*
Redditio Animæ, ii. 513.
Redemption, i. 179, 190, 395; ii. 41, 46, 268, 354; economy of, 251 sq., 288. See *Economy.*

Redsloh, ii. 414.
Rees, Thos., ii. 212, 421.
Reformation, ii. 139, sq., 228, sq. See *Protestantism, Lutheranism, Calvinism*, etc.
Reformation, in its second stage, ii. 374, sq.
Reformation, works on, i. 40.
Reformation in England, Calvinistic, ii. 185.
Reformed (see *Calvinism*), ii. 141.
Reformed (Calvinistic) *Confessions on Scripture*, ii. 232.
Reformed Presbyterians, ii. 431.
Refutatio of 1557, ii. 272.
Regeneration, baptismal, ii. 366, 368.
Regiaticum concilium, on extreme unction, ii. 112.
Regula Fidei, i. 129.
Reid, ii. 433.
Reimarus, H. S., ii. 381.
Reinbeck, ii. 377.
Reinhard, ii. 397, 409, 477, 481, 511, 514, 519; on demoniacs, 483; on the fall, 488; atonement, 498.
Reinhold, ii. 409.
Reinmar of Zweter, ii. 72.
Relationships in Marriage, prohibited, ii. 117.
Relief Secession, ii. 431.
Relics, ii. 301.
Religio, i. 312.
Religion, history of, i. 19; works on, 20; defined, ii. 311, 461.
Remigius, Abp., ii. 56, 59.
Remissiones peccatorum, i. 189.
Remonstrants, ii. 208, 214; articles of, 214, 215; on Scripture, 232; on justification, 284; on Trinity, 332.
Renasci, i. 201.
Repentance, works of, ii. 69. See *Works*.
Representation of the Church, ii. 300.
Reprobatio, i. 281, 304. See *Election*.
Res sacramenti, ii. 116.
Resemblance to God, ii. 18. See *Image*.
Restoration, i. 376. See *Eschatology*.
Resurrection, i. 213, 217, 369, 372; ii. 122.
Retribution, i. 373. See *Hell*.
Rettberg, i. 191; on Occam, ii. 105, 106.
Reuchlin, John, i. 407.
Reusch, Peter, ii. 378.
Reuss, ii. 414.
Revelation, idea of, i. 311, 416; ii. 463.
Revelation, the, i. 213, 214; ii. 120.
Revelation and Inspiration, ii. 245. See *Inspiration*.
Reves: see *Servetus*.
Revival of Letters, i. 411.
Reynolds, Ed., ii. 182, 188.
Rhyn, Van. ii. 413.
Ribow, ii. 377.
Ricci, ii. 455.
Rice, N. L., ii. 445.
Richard St. Victor, i. 383, 392, 394; on reason, 420; omnipresence of God, 445, 446; omnipotence, 448; the Trinity, 467; soul and body, ii. 14; on incarnation, 54.
Richards, James, ii. 445.
Richter, F., ii. 521.
Ridgeley, ii. 183, 191, 420.
Ridley, ii. 182, 184.
Ries, ii. 209; on faith, 285
Riggs, ii. 448.
Righteousness, original, ii. 251: see *Image*.
Ripley, George, ii. 447.
Ripley, H. J., ii. 448.
Ritter, H., ii. 409; on Erigena, i. 388; on scholasticism, 386, 390; Aquinas, 397
Rivetus, ii. 170, 173, 180, 182, 215.
Robbers' Synod, i. 278.
Robert of Melun, i. 395, 396.
Robert Pulleyn, ii. 14: see *Pulleyn*.
Robertson, F. W., ii. 428.
Robertson, Wm., ii. 431.
Robinson, Edward, ii. 447.
Robinson, John, ii. 192.
Rochelle, synod, ii. 166.
Rodaz, ii. 516.
Roger: see *Bacon*.
Rogers, Henry, ii. 429.
Rogers, John, on church, ii. 296.
Röhr, ii. 398, 475, 491, 511, 514.
Rojas: see *Spinola*.
Rollin, Ledru, ii. 415.
Rokykzana, i. 410.
Romaine, ii. 419, 425.
Romanism, ii. 141, 142, 195 sq., 201; formal and material principles, 228; characteristic doctrines, 229 sq.; tradition, 248; man before the fall, 251; freedom, 268; predestination, 278 sq; Pelagian, 280; justification and works, 281 sq.; the church, 289 sq.; ecclesiastical power, 290; the church a state, 299; worship of saints, etc., 301; sacraments, 303; the mass, 308; atonement, 357; baptism, 364.
Romanism and Protestantism, ii. 229 sq., 244 sq., 251 sq., 281 sq., 289 sq., 303 sq., 308 sq.
Roman Catechism, on immortality, ii. 2; on original righteousness, 252; on faith, 283; on seven sacraments, 303; on Word of God, 305.
Roman Catholic Church, ii. 454; theology, 197; mysticism, 203; liberal tendencies, 206: see *Romanism*.
Romish Baptism, ii. 364. See *Re-baptism*.
Rome, council, ii. 89, 92, 94.
Romeyn, ii. 445.
Ronge, ii. 458.
Roos, ii. 518.
Roscelin, i. 384, 391, 393; on Trinity, 457 459.
Rose, ii. 413.
Rosenkranz, i. 28, ii. 409, 470.
Rosenmüller, ii. 463.
Rosicrucians, ii. 157.
Rosmini, ii. 455.
Rothe, i. 19, ii. 469; cited, i. 194, 361, 409, 410, 463; on sin, 488; on Christology, 495; on the church, ii. 511.
Rotheram, ii. 418.
Rothmann Controversy, ii. 246.
Rottmann, ii. 209.
Rougemont, ii. 469.
Rousseau, ii. 380.
Routh, ii. 428.
Rouas (Roxas) *de Spinola*, ii. 219.
Royaards, ii. 413.
Royer-Collard, ii. 415

רוח אלהים, *i.* 125.
Rucelinus: see *Roscelin.*
Rückert, i. 205; on Gregory, 363; on Cyril, 364.
Rudelbach, ii. 453; on inspiration, i. 426.
Rufinus, i. 270, 289; on revelation, 312; on canon, 317; unity of God, 330; the church, 354.
Ruge, ii. 408.
Rule of Faith, i. 51.
Rupert of Duytz, i. 428; on Jews, 383; on incarnation without sin, ii. 53; on transubstantiation, 104.
Rupp, ii. 411.
Russian-Greek Church, ii. 459. See *Greek.*
Russian Schismatics, ii. 460.
Rutherford, Samuel, ii. 185.
Ruysbroek, John, i. 402, 405, 440; on the Trinity, 466; Christology, ii. 39; grace, 66; transubstantiation, 99, 101.
Ryland, ii. 423, 429.

Sabellianism, i. 60, 211, 229, 240, 241, 246, 249, 254, 328, 329; ii. 328, 329, 457.
Sabunde: see *Raimund.*
Sacerdotium, ii. 293, 294.
Sachsenspiegel, ii. 72
Sack, A. W., ii. 385.
Sacramentarians, ii. 161.
Sacraments, i. 355, ii. 71, 76, 228, 509, 513; idea of, i. 211, ii. 514; six, 356; seven, 76; four, 76; twelve, 78; in Old Testament, 81, 82; seven or two, 303; Protestant view of, 116. See *Orders, Marriage, Penance, Extreme Unction*, etc.
Sacramenti integritas, ii. 305.
Sacramentum, i. 211, ii. 116; difference from sacrificium, 310.
Sacramentum necessitatis, dignitatis, consilii, ii. 116.
Sacrifice in Eucharist, i. 204, 311, 367.
Sacrifice of Mass, ii. 95, 308, 310.
Sacrifice and transubstantiation, ii. 100.
Sailer, ii. 453, 456.
Saints, worship of, ii. 74, 76, 301. See *Worship.*
Sale of Indulgences, ii. 325. See *Indulgences.*
Sall, Andrew, ii. 297.
Salmeron, ii. 197, 200.
Salter's Hall Meeting, ii. 422.
Salvian, i. 230, 237; on providence, 325.
Salzmann, ii. 381.
Samosatianism. See *Paul of Samosata.*
Sameness of essence, i. 252. See *Homousia.*
Sampsæi, i. 57.
Sancroft, Abp., ii. 416, 417.
Sanctification, ii. 281, sq., 288, 503.
Sandemanianism, ii. 430, 431.
Sander, ii. 476.
Sanderson, Robert, ii. 296, 298.
Sandius, ii. 332.
Saracens, i. 383.
Saravia, ii. 168, 186.
Sardica council, i. 253.
Sardel (Chardieu), ii. 172.
Sardinoux, ii. 414.
Sarpi, ii. 195.
Sartorius, ii. 404, 406, 494.
Satan, i. 142, 145, 470, 477; restoration of, 146, ii. 43, 264. See *Devil.*
Satisfactio, i. 180; ii. 43, 355.
Satisfactio operis, ii. 109, 325.
Satisfaction theory, ii. 350, 354, 356. See *Atonement.*
Saturninus, i. 59.
Saumur, school of, ii. 168, 178, 180, 182; on original sin, ii. 261, 262.
Savonarola, i. 383, 409, 410, 421; on inspiration, 426, 427; interpretation, 430; on being of God, 432; Trinity, 458, 468; predestination, ii. 63; original sin, 28, 29; grace, 67; faith, 69; on the church, 71, 74.
Saybrook Synod, ii. 192.
Savoy Confession, ii. 169.
Saxon divines, christology of, ii. 352.
Saywell, Wm., ii. 296.
Scepticism, i. 414, 438.
Sceva, i. 114.
Schaff, ii. 448, 450.
Schaffhausen, ii. 413.
Schaller, ii. 409, 475.
Scheffler (Silesius), ii. 204.
Scheibel, ii. 453, 516.
Schelling, ii. 39, 398, sq., 464; on Trinity, 480; on freedom, 487; christology, 492.
Schenkel, ii. 410, 411, 463, 511; on Protestantism, 144.
Scherer, ii. 415, 467.
Scherzer, ii. 199.
Schiller, ii. 398.
Σχίσμα, i. 53.
Schleiermacher, ii. 400, 401, 403, 405; on Artemon, etc., i. 118; Augustine, 333; Arminians, ii. 216; religion, 462; New Testament, 473; his pantheism, 475; on Trinity, 479, 480; angels, 482; on sin, 485, 488; Christology, 490, 494; atonement, 496, 500; election, 507; on the church, 511; sacraments, 514.
Schlichting, ii. 210; on Scripture, 240.
Schliemann, i. 56, 64.
Schlosser, ii. 519.
Schluter, ii. 177.
Schmalz, ii. 210; Catechism, 212.
Schmidlin. See *Andreæ.*
Schmidt, C., ii. 414.
Schmidt, C. A. E., ii. 380.
Schmidt, J. L., ii. 222.
Schmucker, ii. 450.
Schneckenburger, ii. 142; on Calvinism, 160; on the Reformed Christology, 353; atonement, 356.
Schneidemühl, synod, ii. 458.
Schnepf, on Œcolampadius, ii. 314.
Scholastic Subtleties, i. 463; ii. 19, 20, 85.
Scholasticism, i. 259, 381, 386; three periods, 391, 401; Protestant, ii. 154, 170.
Scholten, ii. 413.
Schomann, Catechism, ii. 212.
Schott, H. A., ii. 398.
Scholz, ii. 455.
Schröckh, on Œcolampadius, ii. 372.
Schwabach Articles, ii. 147.
Schwabenspiegel, ii. 72.
Schwarz, ii. 498, 515.

Schwarzerd. See *Melancthon.*
Schwegler, i. 45, 57, 59, 61, 70; ii. 409, 503; on Tertullian, i. 122.
Schweizer, Alex., ii. 407, 413; on Anselm, 45; Lutheranism and Calvinism, 141; Calvinism, 160, 274; Amyraut, 180, 181, 279; atonement, 356; Reformed system, 508.
Schwenkfeld, ii. 154, 155, 284; on the letter and spirit, 237; justification, 287; Lord's Supper, 309, 315; glorified flesh of Christ, 344, 348.
Schulz, trial of, ii. 389.
Schulz, D., ii. 516.
Schulthess, ii. 412.
Schürmann, Maria von, ii. 177.
Schyn, ii. 285.
Scientia media, ii. 280.
Scotigena. See *Erigena.*
Scotch Philosophy and Theology, ii. 182, 430.
Scotists, i. 412, 439; ii. 199, 279, 354.
Scott, John, ii. 420.
Scott, Thos., ii. 184.
Scotus, John Duns, i. 396; works, 398; on reason and revelation, 416, 419; inspiration, 426; ontological argument, 432, 436; freedom of God, 453; theodicy, 474; angelology, 476; the devil, 477, 478; on immortality, ii. 16; sin, 26; original justice, 28; immaculate conception, 30, 32; adoptionism, 38; atonement, 46, 51; incarnation without sin, 54; predestination, 62; on coöperation, 64; sacraments, 80; eucharist, 91; penance, 111; resurrection, 124; future state, 132, 133.
Scripture, i. 82, 421; authority of, ii. 374: see *Bible.*
Scripture and Tradition (see *Tradition*), ii. 465.
Scrivener, ii. 189.
Scriver, ii. 156.
Seabury, ii. 449.
Secker, Abp., ii. 449.
Second Advent, i. 213, ii. 370: see *Advent.*
Secret Marriages, i. 116.
Secta, i. 53.
Sects, ii. 208.
Secularism, ii. 475.
Sedgwick, ii. 424.
Seekers, ii. 222.
Seiler, G. F., ii. 383, 386, 498.
Seiss, ii. 450.
Self-determination, i. 155: see *Freedom.*
Selnecker, ii. 149, 150, 151.
Semi-Arians, i. 229, 253, 254, 256, 259.
Semipelagianism, i. 229, 241, 305, ii. 63.
Semisch, i. 127, 139; on Logos, 119.
Semler, ii. 389, 464; on Strigel, 151; on theories of inspiration, i. 427; on religion, ii. 461, 462.
Sempiternitas, i. 445.
Sendomir Consensus, ii. 169, 219.
Senf, ii. 467.
Sengler, ii. 457.
Sens council, i. 459.
Sentences, i. 392.
Septuagint, i. 187.
Sergius, i. 283.
Sermons, rationalistic, ii. 382.
Serpent: see *Satan.*
Serotus Lupus on predestination, ii. 56, 58.
Servetus, ii. 210, 211, 271; on Scripture, 238; on Trinity, 328, 330; Christology, 344, 349.
Sethites, i. 163.
Seven Sacraments, ii. 76, 303: see *Sacraments.*
Severians, i. 281, 283.
Severus Sanctus Endelechius, i. 345.
Sextus IV., ii. 30.
Shaftesbury, ii. 222, 226.
Shakers, ii. 451.
Sharp, John, ii. 172, 297.
שטר, i. 142.
Shaw, Samuel, ii. 194.
Shearman, ii. 420.
Shekinah, i. 116.
Shephard, Thos., ii. 192, 298.
Shepherd of Hermas, i. 54, 134, 139, 141, 318: see *Hermas.*
שאול, i. 221.
Sherlock, Thos., ii. 225.
Sherlock, Wm., ii. 222, 297, 328, 332, 333.
Sibbs, ii. 191.
Sibour, ii. 458.
Sibylline Oracles, i. 77, 216, 314, 373, 415.
Sigebert Gemblac, ii. 58.
Sigismund, John, ii. 168.
Sigismund Confession, ii. 275.
Signa (sacramenta), ii. 303.
Silberschlag, ii. 481.
Silesius, Angelus, ii. 204, 340.
Simeon, Chs., ii. 425.
Simia Aristotelis, i. 397.
Similarity of essence, i. 252: see *Homoiousianism.*
Similitudo, i. 290, ii. 20.
Simon, Richard, ii. 206; on inspiration, 247.
Simon, Jules, ii. 415.
Simon Magus, i. 54.
Simonetti, ii. 519.
Simpson, ii. 431.
Sin, i. 290–301, ii. 22, 485; of the devils, i. 145; imputed, 155, 159, 168; as negative, 161; Lutheran definitions, ii. 266; against the Holy Ghost, 266: see *Original Sin, Peccatum.*
Sins after baptism, i. 189, 352, ii. 110.
Sinlessness of Christ, i. 178, ii. 31, 490, 494: see *Christology.*
Sinlessness of Mary, ii. 31: see *Mary.*
Sintenis, ii. 520.
Sirmian Formula on the Descensus, i. 351.
Sixtus IV., ii. 33.
Skelton, ii. 384, 385, 418.
Skinner, ii. 445.
Slater's Draft, ii. 296.
Sleep of soul, i. 217, ii. 129, 370, 517, 519.
Smalbrooke, Bp., ii. 226, 227.
Smalcald Articles, ii. 146; on Scripture, 232; worship of saints, 301; Word of God, 305; the mass, 311; Lord's Supper 310, 316; penance, 325; confession, 325 purgatory, 326.
Smalley, ii. 435, 437.
Smaragdus, i. 455.
Smectymnus, ii. 298.
Snape, ii. 417.

Smith, Elisha, ii. 384.
Smith, Joe, ii. 452.
Smith, John, ii. 183, 193; on justification, 285.
Smith, John Pye, ii. 421, 423, 429.
Smith, S. Stanhope, ii. 445.
Smyth, Thomas, ii. 445.
Socinianism, ii. 210, 218, 464, 489, 513; on Scripture, 232, 239, 240, 241; inspiration, 244; Pelagianism, 271; on justification, 281 sq., 284; the church, 295; the sacraments, 303; Supper, 309, 320; Trinity, 328 sq.; limits omniscience, 335; on creation, 339; angels, 341; person of Christ, 344; atonement, 354 sq., 360; incarnation, 363; baptism, 364, 367; infant baptism, 369.
Socinus, ii. 210, 212; catechism, 212; on Scripture, 240; inspiration, 244; on state of innocence, 254; on immortality, 254; on original sin, 260; on the church, 293; the Trinity, 328, 331; Christology, 344, 349; the atonement, 359, 360; baptism, 367.
Société Evangelique, ii. 415.
Societies, religious, ii. 390.
Sohnius, ii. 175, 176.
Soissons, council, i. 459.
Sola Fides, ii. 281, 286.
Soldan, ii. 416.
Solly, ii. 503, 507.
Solutio (Grotian), ii. 355.
Son and Logos, i. 243, 246.
Soothsaying, i. 87.
Sophronius, i. 283.
Soteriology, i. 345; ii. 35, 36, 344 sq.
Σοφία, i. 115, 125, 466.
Soul, origin of, i. 151. See *Creatianism*, *Preëxistence*, *Traducianism*.
Sources of Christian knowledge, i. 82, 315, 421; ii. 229.
South, ii. 183, 190, 329, 332.
Southey's Wesley, ii. 392.
Souverain, i. 51, 127.
Spalding, ii. 385, 520.
Spalding, Bp., ii. 459.
Spangenberg, ii. 392; on sin, 487.
Spanheim, F., ii. 279.
Speculative Method, i. 24.
Speculative Philosophy, ii. 3. See *Philosophy*.
Spelman, Henry, ii. 296.
Spener, ii. 157, 158, 388, 390; on sin, 267; inspiration, 241, 246; the church, 300; creation, 340; eschatology, 370, 372.
Spencer, Herbert, ii. 425.
Σφραγίς, i. 198.
Spinckes, ii. 297, 417.
Spinola, Ronas de, ii. 219.
Spinoza, ii. 221, 470, 475, 491.
Spiratio (Trinity), ii. 336.
Spiritual Participation in the Supper, ii. 317. See *Lord's Supper*.
Spirituales, i. 384, 423.
Spiritualism, ii. 452.
Spitting in the Mass, ii. 91.
Spittler, ii. 386.
Spring, Gardiner, ii. 443.
Spring, Samuel, ii. 439.
Sprinkling, ii. 85. See *Baptism*.
Stackhouse, ii. 226, 418.
Stahl, ii. 411, 453.
Stancarus, Francis, ii. 149, 362, 363.
Staudenmaier, ii. 457; on scholastics, i. 391; on Erigena, 417.
Stäudlin, K. F., ii. 396, 499; on Limborch, 216.
Stanley, A. P., ii. 428.
Stapfer, ii. 378.
Staphylus, ii. 286.
Staroverzi, ii. 460.
State and church, ii. 71, 299. See *Church*.
Status exaltationis, inanitionis, ii 351.
Stearns, ii. 505.
Steffens, ii. 385, 406, 453, 494.
Steinbart, ii. 382, 496, 498.
Steinmetz, ii. 392.
Stennett, ii. 429.
Stephen de Borbone, ii. 128.
Stephen Gobarus, i. 38.
Stephen, of Rome, i. 202.
Stercorianism, ii. 91.
Stevenson, ii. 434.
Stewart, Dugald, ii. 433.
St. Hilaire, Rosseeuw, ii. 195.
Stiebritz, ii. 383.
Stiles, Ezra, ii. 438.
Stier, ii. 497.
Stilling, Jung., ii. 394.
Stillingfleet, ii. 183, 188, 227, 296, 297, 298, 333.
Stolz, ii. 412.
Stone, J. S., ii. 449.
Storch, ii. 209, 222, 383, 387.
Storr, ii. 397, 468, 498.
Stourdza, ii. 459.
Stosch, ii. 383.
Strabo, Walafried, ii. 90.
Strähler, ii. 376.
Strasburg, i. 412.
Strauss, D. F., ii. 409; cited, i. 45; ii. 413, 469, 471, 511; on eucharist, i. 206; Socinianism, ii. 212; on Being of God, 477; Christology, 495; immortality, 521.
Strigel, Victoria, ii. 149, 150; against Flacius, 261, 262.
Ströbel, ii. 516.
Strong, Nathan, ii. 440.
St. Simonism, ii. 457.
Stuart, Moses, ii. 447.
Stübner, ii. 209.
Studien und Kritiken, ii. 410.
Studita, Theodore, ii. 26, 76, 79.
Stunden. See *Andacht*, ii. 398.
Sturm, ii. 514.
Suadela, in Irenæus, i. 183.
Suarez, ii. 197, 200, 280.
Subdiaconi, ii. 115.
Sublapsarianism, ii. 268, 274.
Subordination of the Son, i. 130 244, 249
Subscription to Articles, ii. 417, 422.
Subsequent Will, i. 332.
Substantia, i. 264.
Subtleties. See *Scholastic*.
Succession. See *Apostolic*.
Seuvic Syngramma, ii. 314.

Sufferings of Christ (divine or human), ii. 362. See *Death of Christ.*
Sulzer, J. G., ii. 324.
Sulzer, S., ii. 519.
Σύμβολον, i. 17, 200.
Summas, i. 396.
Συνάφεια, i. 275.
Σύναξις, i. 205.
Συνουσιασταί, i. 275.
Supererogation, works of, ii. 68, 70. See *Works.*
Supernaturalism, ii. 240, 395 sq., 404, 406, 407, 463, 474, 511.
Superstition, ii. 387.
Supralapsarianism, ii. 268, 274.
Suso, Henry, i. 402, 404; on knowing God, 440; on pantheism, 444; on the Trinity, 465; creation, 473; atonement, ii. 52; grace, 66; heaven, 135; eternal punishment, 138.
Susskind, ii. 397, 467.
Swamerdam, ii. 178.
Sweden, ii. 412.
Swedenborg, ii. 391, 393; on interpretation, 472; on angels and devils, 482, 483; on Christ and Trinity, 479; on sin, 487; Christology, 489, 491; on imputation, 506; on the church, 509, 510; eschatology, 520.
Swiss Reformation, ii. 160.
Switzerland, ii. 413.
Swords, the two, ii. 71, 72.
Sykes, ii. 184, 195, 213, 225, 227.
Sylvester II. (Gerbert), i. 389.
Symbolic books, i. 17, 31, 42; authority of, ii. 374.
Symbolic view of the Supper, i. 362; ii. 89, 312.
Symbolism, in worship, ii. 290.
Symbolism, ii. 142, 405.
Symbolism, age of, ii. 139 sq.
Symbolism in art, i. 35.
Symbolum Quicunque, i. 268: see *Athanasian Creed.*
Symington, ii. 434.
Syncretism, ii. 157, 158, 218.
Synergism, ii. 64, 148, 272.
Synesius, i. 370.
Synge, Abp., ii. 225.
Syngramma Suevicum, ii. 314.
Synnada, synod, i. 202.
Synods (see *Councils*) of Antioch, i. 248; Boston, ii. 169; Cambridge, 169; Charenton, 181; Delft, 179; Dort, 165; Jerusalem, 207; Loudun, 181; Newtown, 292; of Robbers, i. 278; Rochelle, ii. 166; Saybrook, 192.
Synoptic Evangelists, i. 44; ii. 489.
Synthetic method, ii. 150, 152.
Systems (modern German) of theology, ii. 382.
Systematic Theology, i. 381, ii. 382.
Système de la Nature, ii. 379.
Szegeden (Seegedin), ii. 174.

Tables of Church History, i. 40.
Taborites, i. 410.
Tafel, ii. 393.
Tajo of Saragossa, i. 387.
Tante, ii. 409.
Tappan, ii. 438, 442, 447.
Tarragona Council, i. 430.
Taste Scheme, ii. 436.
Tatian, i. 63, 68; on Logos, 120; anthropology, 148, 149; image of God, 154; on freedom, 155; immortality, 158.
Tauler, John, i. 402, 404, 440; ii. 394, 438; on pantheism, 444; on Trinity, 464; angels, 477; on the fall, ii. 23; Christology, 39; atonement, 52; on assurance, 65, 66; on Mary, 75; Lord's Supper, 101.
Taylor, Isaac, ii. 425.
Taylor, Jeremy, ii. 183, 188, 276, 297; on episcopacy, 296; on baptism, 366.
Taylor of Norwich, ii. 385, 419.
Taylor, N. W., ii. 440.
Tears: see *Baptism.*
Teleological argument, i. 99, ii. 476.
Telesio, ii. 221.
Teller, ii. 383, 387, 464.
Temperaments, ii. 13.
Tennent, ii. 438.
Tertullian, i. 63, 76, 77, 78, 79; works, 69; on inspiration, 89; tradition, 96; being of God, 101; on anthropomorphism, 108, 109; on holiness of God, 111; penalty, 112; on Logos, 121; on Holy Spirit, 127; Trinity, 129, 130; providence, 136; demons, 143, 146; anthropology, 149; traducianism, 151; freedom, 155; immortality, 158; the fall, 165; Christology, 170, 174; Christ sinless, 178; satisfaction, 180; justification, 190; on the church, 196; on baptism, 197, 198; on Lord's Supper, 204, 207; on sacraments, 212; judgment, 216; intermediate state, 222.
Territorial system, ii. 509.
Tessard, ii. 279.
Testament of XII Patriarchs, i. 216.
Testamentum, i. 34.
Testimonium animæ, i. 99.
Testimony of the Spirit, ii. 245.
Tetrapolitan Confession on Lord's Supper, ii. 317.
Tetratheism, i. 267, 457, 459.
Tetzel, theses, ii. 139, 144.
Thaddeus, in Eusebius, i. 187.
Thaer, ii. 381.
Thalia of Arius, i. 249.
Thamer, ii. 284, 359; on the Bible, 237.
Θεάνθρωπος, i. 174.
Theism, i. 441, ii. 222, 474, 481.
Θέλημα ἑπόμενον, προηγούμενον, i. 332, 474.
Themistius, i. 281.
Theodicy, ii. 337, 469, 581: see *Providence.*
Theodoret of Cyrus, i. 230, 234: on Holy Spirit, 263, 282; traducianism, 288; apologetics, 313; inspiration, 322; on Providence, 335; on angelolatry, 338; Lord's Supper, 366.
Theodore Abukara, ii. 38.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, i. 230, 234; on Holy Spirit, 263; Nestorianism, 275 Augustine, 305; inspiration, 321, 322 punishment, 380; adoptionism, ii. 36.
Theodore of Pharan, i. 2[illegible]4.
Theodore Studita, ii. 26, 76, 79.

Theodosius, i. 277.
Theodotus, i. 60, 61, 117.
Theodulph of Orleans, i. 454.
Theognis of Nice, i. 253.
Theognostus, i. 244.
Theologia Germanica, i. 402, 405. See *Deutsche Theologie*.
Theologia Irregenitorum, ii. 288.
Theologische Jahrbücher, ii. 410.
Theology and Philosophy, ii. 375: see *Philosophy*.
Theology of the Fathers, i. 63; scholastic, 391; modern, ii. 404; change in the treatment of, 382; Roman Catholic, 197; of Jesuits, 197, 201; in France, 414; in England, 182, 416, 423; in Scotland, 182, 430; in New England, 183, 192; in United States, 435 sq.; Puritan, 183; Lutheran, 150; Calvinistic, 170; German Reformed, 175.
Theopaschites, i. 279.
Theophanies, i. 115.
Theophilus of Alexandria, i. 370.
Theophilus of Antioch, i. 63, 68, 81, 110; on inspiration, 89; on being of God, 101; Logos, 120; Trinity, 129; on Holy Spirit, 126; on creation, 134; on freedom, 155; the fall, 164; baptism, 199; millennium, 215; resurrection, 219.
Theophylactus, i. 385, ii. 26; on eucharist, 109.
Theosophy, Lutheran, ii. 155: see *Mysticism*.
Θεοτόκος, i. 275.
Theramo, Jacob de, ii. 53.
Therese a Jesu, ii. 205.
Thesaurus meritorum, supererogationis, ii. 69.
Theses of Luther, ii. 139; of Harms, ii. 405.
Thirty-nine Articles, ii. 164, 166, 167; on tradition, 249; original sin, 259; predestination, 280; on justification, 285; the church, 295, 296; the sacraments, 304, 306; the Lord's Supper, 322; purgatory, etc., 327; on redemption, 357.
Thmetopsychites, ii. 129, 159, 221.
Tholuck, ii. 389, 396, 467; on the apologists, 385; Semler, 386; on Gruner, 387; on sin, 488.
Thom, J. H., ii. 422.
Thomas: see *Aquinas*.
Thomas: see *Kempis*.
Thomas of Bradwardine, ii. 61, 62.
Thomas of Cellano, ii. 121.
Thomas-Christians, i. 241.
Thomasius, ii. 410, 502; on redemption, i. 347; on Anselm, ii. 46.
Thomasius, Christian, ii. 157, 158, 310, 341, 510; on Church and State, 300.
Thomassin, ii. 198.
Thomists, i. 412, 439, ii. 199, 279.
Thorn Colloquy, ii. 219.
Thorn Declaration, ii. 164, 168; on immaculate conception, 262.
Thorndike, ii. 186, 296.
Thornwell, ii. 445.
Thummius, ii. 353, 354.
Thysius, ii. 215.
Tichonius on the church, i. 354.
Tiedge, ii. 398.
Tieftrunk, ii. 395, 396, 499, 516.
Til, Solvan, ii. 178.
Tillotson, ii. 183, 194; baptism of, 369.
Timor filialis, servilis, ii. 111.
Tindal, ii. 222, 226.
Titus Bostrus, i. 330; on resurrection, 370.
Toland, ii. 222, 225.
Toledo, council, i. 263.
Töllner, ii. 478, 496; on word of God, 466.
Tomline, ii. 418, 420.
Tongues (Irvingite), ii. 414.
Toplady, ii. 184, 420; on Charnock, 190.
Torgau Articles, ii. 147.
Torments of hell, ii. 132.
Torquemada, ii. 33.
Toulouse Council on Bible reading, i. 430.
Tournely, ii. 199.
Tractarians: see *Oxford School, Puseyites*.
Tracts for Times, ii. 423, 425.
Tradition, i. 82, 95, 315, 323, 421; ii. 230, 248, 465.
Traditionalism, ii. 458; Roman See on, 465.
Traducianism, i. 151, 286; ii. 13, 263.
Traheren, Dean, letter to Bullinger, ii. 185.
Transilio, ii. 95.
Transcendentalism, ii. 446.
Transubstantiatio, first used by Hildebert of Tours. ii. 95, 96.
Transubstantiation, ii. 89; referred to the whole Trinity, 99: see *Lord's Supper*.
Travers, ii. 186.
Travis, Archibald, ii. 421.
Trechsel, i. 248; on Anabaptists, ii. 211.
Tregelles, ii. 423, 428.
Trench, Dean, ii. 423, 428, 471.
Trent, Council of, ii. 195 sq.; Scripture, 232; on interpretation, 234; Vulgate edition, 235; on freedom, 269; original righteousness, 251; original sin, 260; on immaculate conception, 263; justification, 282; faith, 282; on saints and images, 301, 302; number of sacraments, 303; opus operatum, 306; Lord's Supper, 310; penance, 325; purgatory, 325.
Treves, coat of, ii. 458.
Triads, i. 114, 126, 129.
Triangle Controversy, ii. 442, 443.
Τριάς, i. 129.
Trichotomy, i. 149, 158: see *Anthropology*.
Trimurti, i. 114.
Trinitas, i. 129.
Trinity, i. 118, 123, 125, 129, 229, 244, 246, 262, 453, 457; ii. 210, 478, 481; formulas, i. 264, ii. 335, 336; in creation, i. 334, ii. 339, 473; in Old Testament, 337; and history of the world, i. 469; transubstantiated, ii. 99.
Tritheism, i. 130, 247, 457, ii. 328.
Trithemius, Chronicle, ii. 120.
Trishagion, i. 280.
Triumphant Church, ii. 291.
Tronchin, ii. 279.
Trottet, ii. 413.
Trullan Council, First, i. 283.
Truman, Joseph, ii. 194.
Truth of Christianity, i. 114, ii. 463: see *Evidences*.
Tryon, ii. 205.

Tübingen Divines, ii. 238, 351.
Tübingen school (Baur), i. 48, 56.
Tucker Abraham, ii. 422.
Tuckney, ii. 190.
Τύπος, i. 283.
Turlupines, i. 384.
Turner, S. H., ii. 448.
Turrecremata, ii. 33.
Turretine, F., ii. 168; on obedience of Christ, 359.
Turretine, John Alpb., ii. 178, 180, 247, 377.
Twesten, ii. 410, 464.
Twisse, ii. 183, 187, 190.
Twysden, ii. 297.
Tyler, ii. 240.
Tyler, Samuel, ii. 446.
Tyng, ii. 449.
Tyre, council i. 253.
Tzschirner, ii. 398.

Ubiquity of Christ's body, ii. 309, 316: see *Christology*.
Udo, i. 290.
Ueberfeldt, ii. 156.
Uhlich, ii. 411.
Ullmann, i. 413, ii. 494; on Gregory the Great, i. 294; on scholastics, 391; on Nicolas of Methone, 464, ii. 109; Wessel, 52.
Urici, ii. 408, 475.
Ulster Synod, ii. 435.
Umbreit, ii. 472, 473.
Unconditional election, ii. 60.
Uncreated light, i. 474.
Unction, extreme, ii. 112; repetition of, 113.
Underworld, i. 187, ii. 130: see *Hades*.
Unio mystica, i. 188, ii. 288.
Unio personalis, ii. 344, 351.
Unio sacramentalis, ii. 324.
Union, attempts at, ii. 218, 452.
Unitarians, i. 131, ii. 208, 210, 417, 478; in England, 210, 213; controversy in England, 421, 422; in New England, 436; in Ireland, 431: see *Socinians*.
United Brethren, ii. 71, 391, 506, 509, 510, 513.
United States, ii. 509: see *America*.
Unity of Church, i. 195: see *Church*.
Unity of God, i. 102, 110, 330, 445.
Universal Church, ii. 299.
Universalism of grace, ii. 180, 275, 357.
Universalismus hypotheticus, i. 277, 278.
Universal priesthood, ii. 71.
Universalists in America, ii. 443, 451.
Upham, ii. 446.
Upsal, university, ii. 376.
Usages in baptism, ii. 364.
Usher, ii. 182, 185, 327; on ordination, 297.
Usteri, ii. 412; on atonement, 502.
Utilitarianism, ii. 423.
Urban IV., ii. 95.
Urban VIII., ii. 280.
Urlsperger, ii. 390, 478.
Ursinus, ii. 164, 175.
Uytenbogard, ii. 215.

Valdez, John, ii. 211.
Valence, councils, i. 306, ii. 57, 60.
Valencia, controversy on transubstantiation, ii. 99.
Valentinus, i. 118, 171, 198.
Valentinians, i. 58, 149, ii. 31, 344.
Validity of baptism, ii 364, 369: see *Romish*.
Valla: see *Laurentius*.
Van der Weijen, ii. 174.
Van Ess, ii. 455.
Van Hemmert, ii. 467.
Van Mildert, ii. 213, 418.
Van Osterzee, ii. 413.
Van Prinsterer, ii. 413.
Van Rhyn, ii. 413.
Van Til, ii. 178, 179.
Van Wijpersse, ii. 413.
Vanini, ii. 221.
Variata of Augsburg Confession, ii. 147.
Vasquez, ii. 197, 200, 280.
Vatke, ii. 473.
Vaud, Canton de, ii. 412, 510.
Vaughan, R., ii. 424, 429.
Venial sins, ii. 23, 25.
Venn, Henry, ii. 425.
Ventura, ii. 455.
Véra, ii. 408.
Vercelli Synod, ii. 89, 92, 94.
Vergier, Jean du (St. Cyran), ii. 202.
Vicarious satisfaction, i. 180: see *Atonement*.
Vicarious suffering, ii. 354: *ibid*.
Victors: see *Hugo*, *William*, *Walter*.
Vienne Synods, ii. 84. 95.
Vigilius Tapsensis, i. 269.
Vincens of Lerins, i. 230, 237, 269, 308; on tradition, 324.
Vincent of Nismes, ii. 414.
Vinet, ii. 279, 407, 414, 416, 511.
Viret, ii. 318.
Virgilius, i. 473.
Virginity of Mary, ii. 30.
Virtue, Edwards on, ii. 437.
Virtues of heathen, ii. 256, 277.
Virtus instrumentalis, ii. 80.
Vishnoo, i. 114.
Visible Church, i. 354, ii. 299.
Visigoths, i. 264.
Vitringa, ii. 178, 179; on baptism, 365.
Vitium originis, i. 165: see *Original sin*.
Vladislas II., ii. 168.
Vocatio, ii. 288.
Voëtius, ii. 170, 172, 179.
Vogel, ii. 467.
Vogt, ii. 475.
Volckmar, i. 54.
Völkel, ii. 210.
Voltaire, ii. 379, 381.
Voluntas antecedens, consequens, i. 470, see θέλημα; signi, beneplaciti, 474.
Vowel points inspired, ii. 244.
Vridankes Bescheidenheit, ii. 72.
Vulgate version, ii. 230.

Wafers, consecrated, ii. 107.
Wakefield, Gilbert, ii. 422.
Wagner, J., ii. 179.
Wagner, R., ii. 475.
Wake, Abp., ii. 183, 189, 298; on foreign orders, 297.
Walæus, ii. 215.

Walafried Strabo, ii. 90.
Walch, C. W. F., ii. 496, 498; on Felix, 37.
Walch, J. G., ii. 392.
Waldenses, i. 384, 430, ii. 69, 71; on penance, 109, 111; allegorizing on penance, 111; on purgatory, 127, 128.
Waldschmidt, ii. 507.
Wallis, ii. 329, 332.
Walker, George, ii. 191.
Walker, James, ii. 446.
Walter St. Victor, i. 395, 396.
Warburton, ii. 384, 410.
Ward, W. G., ii. 426, 459.
Wardlaw, ii. 422, 431, 435, 471.
Wardley, ii. 451.
Ware, Henry, ii. 441.
Washing of feet, ii. 209, 305, 514.
Water of baptism, mystical sense, ii. 84; substitutes, 84.
Waterland, ii. 183, 184, 188, 210, 213; on Athanasian creed, i. 269; on baptism, ii. 366; lay baptism, 369.
Waterlandians, ii. 209.
Watson, Rd., ii. 381, 393, 418.
Watson, Thomas, ii. 183, 191.
Wayland, ii. 449.
Webster, ii. 213.
Wegscheider, ii. 398, 506; on religion, 462; on atonement, 499.
Weigel, ii. 154, 155, 371; on person of Christ, 350.
Weishaupt, ii. 381.
Weisse, ii. 409, 410, 471; on Trinity, 480.
Weissenborn on pantheism, ii. 475.
Weissmann, C. E., ii. 377.
Wetzsäcker, ii. 503.
Welch, ii. 434.
Wells, ii. 213.
Wendelin, ii. 170, 173, 175, 176, 300; on providence, 341.
Werenfels, ii. 178, 180, 247, 377.
Wesel, John, i. 410; on the church, ii. 71, 73.
Wesel, synod, ii. 165.
Wesley, John, ii. 391, 393, 423, 425, 506; on interpretation, 428, 430; on being of God, 433, 437.
Wessel, John, i. 409, 410, 444, 457; on Trinity, 458, 468; demonology, 478; image of God, ii. 21; freedom, 22; Christology, 40; atonement, 47, 52; regeneration, 53; faith, 69; the church, 71, 73; opus operatum, 80; Lord's Supper, 102; transubstantiation, 104, 107; on penance, 109, 111; on purgatory, 127.
Wessenberg and his school, ii. 456.
West, ii. 226.
West, Samuel, ii. 437.
West, Stephen, ii. 435, 437.
Western Church, i. 239, 385, 453, ii. 25: see *Latin*.
Westminster Assembly, ii. 169, 182.
Westminster Confession, on original sin, ii. 259; decrees, freedom, redemption, 276; on predestination, 281; the church, 292; the sacraments, 304, 305; the Lord's Supper, 309, 321; descent to hell, 354; on atonement, 357; active and passive obedience, 359; baptism, 368, 369; on lay baptism, 369, 370.
Westminster Confession in New England, ii. 192.
Westphal, ii. 319.
Wette: see *De Wette*.
Wetmore, J., ii. 448.
Wetstein, ii. 383, 385, 413, 478, 519.
Whately, ii. 423, 427, 519.
Whedon, ii. 448.
Whelpley, ii. 443.
Whewell, ii. 425.
Whichcote, ii. 193.
Whiston, Wm., 195, 213, 225, 226.
Whitaker, Wm., ii. 185.
Whitby, ii. 195, 213, 227, 371.
White, Francis, ii. 297.
Whitefield, ii. 393, 413, 425, 432, 435, 506.
Whitgift, ii. 184.
Wicel, George, ii. 198.
Wieland, ii. 381.
Wiest, ii. 456.
Wigand, John, ii. 152.
Wiggers, i. 306, 310.
Wigglesworth, ii. 448.
Wilberforce, H. W., ii. 426, 459.
Wilberforce, R. I., ii. 426.
Wilberforce, Bp. Samuel, ii. 426.
Wilberforce, Wm., ii. 425.
Will of God, i. 452; as antecedent and consequent, 332, 470, 474.
Willard, Samuel, ii. 193.
William: see *Occam*.
William of Auvergne, ii. 17.
William of Champeaux, i. 392, 394.
William of Paris, i. 421; on atonement, ii. 49.
Williams, ii. 182.
Williams, Ed., ii. 184, 420.
Williams, Rowland, ii. 429.
Willis, ii. 205.
Wilkins, D., ii. 296.
Willett, Andrew, ii. 297.
Wills in Christ, i. 183, ii. 35: see *Monothelites*.
Wilson, Daniel, ii. 425.
Wilson, J. L., ii. 443.
Wilson, J. P., ii. 443.
Wilson, Matthias, ii. 194.
Wilson, Thomas, ii. 418.
Wimpina, ii. 144, 198.
Winchester, ii. 451.
Wine in Eucharist, i. 207.
Winer, ii. 406; on Arminians, 270; on sacrifice of mass, 310.
Wingen, ii. 168.
Wisdom, i. 115, 123, 125, 244, 466, 469.
Wise, John, ii. 298.
Wiseman, ii. 459; on Amphilochius, i. 361.
Wislicenus, ii. 411, 466.
Wissowatius, ii. 210.
Witasse, ii. 199.
Witches, i. 477, ii. 341.
Witherspoon, ii. 438.
Withholding of cup, ii. 308: see *Cup*.
Wittenberg Divines, ii. 288.
Wittenberg University, ii. 148.
Witsius, ii. 170, 174.
Wodrow, ii. 192.
Wolf, ii. 376, 389, 398.
Wolfenbüttel Fragments, ii. 378, 384, 490.

Wollebius, ii. 170, 172; Christology, 352; on Christ's obedience, 358.
Wolmar, ii. 389.
Wolfersdorf, ii. 388.
Wolzogen, ii. 210
Woodbridge, John, 440.
Woods, Leonard, 440.
Woolston, ii. 222.
Worcester Council, ii. 113.
Worcester, N., ii. 441.
Word, the, i. 244: see *Logos*.
Word of God, i. 421; ii. 231, 303, 465.
Wordsworth, C., i. 423, 428, 429.
Works, i. 189, ii. 67, 281, 289, 501; of penance, 109; of supererogation, 68, 70.
World, end of, ii. 119: see *End. Eschatology*.
Worship of Angels, i. 141; forbidden, 338; of images, i. 229, 239; of saints, ii. 74, 301; of Virgin, 30.
Worthington, Wm., ii. 418.
Wunden-homilieen, ii. 392.
Wurtemberg Confession, on angels, ii. 341.
Wycliffe, John de, i. 408; works, 409; on faith, 423: atonement, ii. 47, 51; on predestination, 63; indulgences, 70; universal priesthood. 72; on number of sacraments, 80; on opus operatum, 81, 83; confirmation, 87, 88; on transubstantiation, 104, 107; on Antichrist, 121; purgatory, 127, 128.
Wyttenbach, D., ii. 378.

Xenaias, i. 281.
Ximenes, i. 408.

Yates, ii. 422.
Ὑποπάτωρ, ii. 257.
Ὑστάσης, i. 81.

Yvon, i. 177.
Young, Brigham, ii. 452.
Young Hegelians, ii. 407.

Zacharias, ii. 383, 386.
Zacharias of Chrysopolis, ii. 108.
Zanchius, ii. 172, 175, 176, 272.
Zeitschrift f. christl. Wissenschaft, ii. 410.
Zeller, ii. 409.
Zend, i. 113.
Zeno, Emperor, i. 280.
Zeno of Verona, i. 245.
Zenobia, i. 248.
Zerbolt, i. 431.
Zigabenus, i. 383, 385, 423, ii. 26.
Zinzendorf, ii. 391, 457, 491, 496, 497, 506, 510; on Trinity, 479.
Zollikoffer, ii. 385, 486.
Zosimus, i. 298.
Zurich, ii. 413; reform in, 159.
Zurich, confession, ii. 164, 165.
Zurich, Disputation, ii. 160.
Zurich, Letters, on Calvinism in England, ii. 185.
Zwingle, ii. 140, 159; works, 160; influence, 162; Fidei Ratio, 162; on Anabaptists, 209, 236; on Scripture, 230; inspiration, 242; original rectitude, 253; original sin, 256; decrees, 273; on virtues of heathen, 277; priesthood 294; on discipline, 299; sacraments, 303, 306; on Lord's Supper, 309, 312; on intermediate state, 326; preservation, 340; Satan, 341; incarnation, 345; allœosis, 346; atonement, 356; baptism, 364, 366, 515.
Zwinglian sacraments, ii. 303.
Zwickau prophets, ii. 154, 155, 209.
Zwicker, ii. 213, 332.